



Louisiana Believes

Louisiana Annual Performance Report – Part B **July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013**

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004

John White
State Superintendent of Education
February 3, 2014

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | 1.877.453.2721 | www.louisianabelieves.com |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|

State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mr. Charles E. Roemer
President
6th BESE District

Mr. Jay Guillot
5th BESE District

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

Ms. Carolyn Hill
8th BESE District

Ms. Holly Boffy
Secretary/Treasurer
7th BESE District

Ms. Jane Smith
Member-at-Large

Ms. Kira Orange Jones
2nd BESE District

Dr. Judy Miranti
Member-at-Large

Dr. Lottie P. Beebe
3rd BESE District

Ms. Connie Bradford
Member-at-Large

Mr. Walter Lee
4th BESE District

Ms. Heather Cope
Executive Director

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

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

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The FFY 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed based on the targets and activities in the FFY 2011 State Performance Plan (SPP).

The Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) did not adjust any of the targets or activities in the SPP and therefore will not submit an SPP for FFY 2012.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

Louisiana’s Measurement: As required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Louisiana calculates the graduation rate based on a cohort of students. A cohort of students is all students who entered 9th grade for the first time in the state of Louisiana in a given year. Students who graduate with a high school diploma in four years are considered cohort graduates. Students who complete high school in less than four years are included in the cohort in the year in which they started 9th grade.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 (Data from 2011-2012) | 61.0% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

The percent of all youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma was 33% (1,497 students of 4,542 students). Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 1, but showed a 3.7% gain from the previous year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012:

Improving the graduation rate for all students continues to be a priority for the state. The state implemented multiple initiatives to promote student success, including students with disabilities.

Improvement Activity 1.1 The Office of Content and the Office of Student Programs will disseminate current information on new initiatives and graduation pathways to LEAs, family information centers, and related stakeholders:

- The College and Career Readiness Commission (CCR) and workgroups will recommend actions to the state to address the needs of our students including academic remediation, dropout prevention, and high school diploma obtainment.
- The state will disseminate recommendations from the Commission to LEAs and related stakeholders throughout each academic year using the LDOE’s website.

Discussion of Activity 1.1:

The CCR Commission was created for the sole purpose of making recommendations for the development of statewide policies, guiding principles, and programs that address current and future economic needs of the state and promote success in high school and beyond. The CCR Commission met in March of 2013 and was provided with an overview of the various accomplishments achieved by the LDOE and LEAs. While the LDOE recognized improvement to the overall graduation rate, the state recognizes that students with disabilities fall behind. The CCR Commission made several recommendations for the 2014-2015 school year to include kindergarten readiness, empowering educators to teach, partnering with districts to eliminate failing schools, and improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

In addition to the CCR Commission updates, LDOE hosted a series of discussions with parents, students, educators, and community members around the state to discuss plans to improve the state’s diploma options. The plan includes strengthening Louisiana’s Career Diploma to assist students obtain high demand, high wage jobs. Additionally, the state proposes to simplify the current three diploma pathways to two pathways that include technical career preparation and four year college preparation. LDOE also collaborated with the business community and community colleges to develop a long term plan to implement proposed changes to the diploma options.

The Department was also reorganized to include five Network teams to serve the districts. Each Network serves between 10 and 20 school districts and the team leaders and Network staff work directly with districts to set goals for the classroom, observe classroom practices, and provide support in the implementation of higher standards. The Network teams each have a workflow specialist who works directly with LDOE staff to answer questions related to changes in policies and the implementation of new initiatives **and a team member with experience educating students with disabilities.**

Improvement Activity 1.2 Implement the Graduation Exit Exam (GEE) Waiver Policy for students with disabilities beginning with 2005-06 seniors. This new policy will allow more students with disabilities to graduate by waiving one of the GEE required components when the student’s disability significantly interferes with the ability to pass the test, provided all other graduation criteria are met.

Discussion of Activity 1.2:
Continue the waiver process and review annually to ensure successful outcomes for students. In the 2012-2013 school year there were 348 waivers requested, and 278 waivers were approved. The waiver requests included GEE, Louisiana Alternate Assessment 2 (LAA2), and End of Course (EOC) waivers. The waiver process continues to be a viable option that assists students with obtaining a high school diploma.

Improvement Activity 1.3 Monitor the implementation of the LAA 2 alternate pathway to a high school diploma to determine how many students with disabilities benefit from this alternate pathway to the standard high school diploma.

Discussion of Activity 1.3:
LDOE will continue to monitor the implementation of the LAA 2 alternate pathway through the end of the 2013-2014 school year. The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) will replace the LAA 2 in the 2014-2015 school year. During the initial implementation of PARCC, only students in the third through eighth grade will participate. To prepare for the transition, the state released the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual that included proposed accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities and English language learners. **Students that entered high school prior to 2014-2015 will continue to have access to the LAA 2 alternate pathway to a high school diploma. The LDOE will convene a working group of stakeholders who have served students with disabilities to develop a revised alternate pathway to graduation for students previously eligible for LAA 2 .**

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 (Data from 2011-2012) | 25% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

The percent of all youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school during the 2011-2012 school year was 39% (1,661 students out of 4,243 students).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012:

The state did not meet its target for Indicator 2 and continues to recognize dropout prevention as a priority in the state.

Improvement Activity 2.4 The Division of Dropout Prevention (DOP) will monitor the effectiveness of statewide dropout prevention programs. More specifically, DOP will examine the performance of specific subgroups including students with disabilities:

- The state will monitor the implementation of the Connections dropout prevention program.
- The state will monitor the implementation of Project Employ.
- The state will monitor implementation of Jobs for Americas Graduates (JAG) program.
- The state will monitor implementation of JAG AIM High! Program.

Discussion of Activity 2.4 During the 2012-2103 school year, the state no longer required districts to offer the Connections program for students who were over-age or at-risk. To that end, the state urged districts to implement programs and strategies that addressed their unique needs.

Other programs that addressed at-risk students, including students with disabilities, were the Jobs for America's Graduates Program (JAG) and the JAG AIM High! Program for middle school students. Both programs served a total of 3,847 students. Of those students, 599 out of 692 seniors graduated with a high school diploma.

Improvement Activity 2.5 The DOP will assist high priority schools with data collection and analysis of at-risk student data for students with disabilities.

Discussion of Activity 2.5 See related improvement activities in Indicators 1.2, 1.3 and 13.1

Improvement Activity 2.6 The DOP will provide professional development related to dropout prevention to LEAs on an annual basis.

Discussion of Activity 2.6

During FFY 2012, the DOP released a dropout prevention plan template to all districts whose data indicated that their graduation rate fell below the target of 70%. Districts were given autonomy and allowed to develop and monitor their own dropout prevention plans. This differs from the state’s previous model where state-led teams assisted districts in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the dropout prevention plan. Additionally, Network teams provided support around the needs and strengths of the districts and their schools which included the primary focus of increasing the graduation rate. LEAs are required to keep a current copy of the plan at their schools or at the central office.

There were also districts that continued other dropout prevention and school completion efforts though their partnership with Education’s Next Horizon. There were 14 school districts who partnered with Education’s Next Horizon to implement dropout prevention efforts based on district level and regional needs. This organization worked with select districts from 2009 to 2013. Details on each district’s programs can be found at:

<http://www.ednexthorizon.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/LAPromise-District-Goals-2013.pdf>

Improvement Activity 2.7

- LDOE will work with select schools receiving technical assistance (TA) from the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD).
- LDOE will ensure that parental involvement is included in the school/district TA initiatives.
- LDOE will participate in NDPC-SD cadre meetings and disseminate information to key stakeholders.

Discussion of Activity 2.7

During the 2012-2013 school year, the LDOE worked with NDPC-SD to select schools with students at-risk of dropping out, including students with disabilities. The department was able to collaborate with the Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant (LaSPDG) team to evaluate LaSPDG districts that had dropout prevention as an area of focus. One district was selected to receive intensive targeted TA. The TA included an onsite visit from NDPC-SD to complete a needs assessment with district level administrators in order to determine the priorities for dropout prevention in the district. The district identified parental involvement and community involvement as areas of need and then developed a plan of action to be implemented during the 2013-2014 school year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

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

Measurement:

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY 2012 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|------|---|------|--------|------|---|------|--------|------|
| | Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A) | | Participation for Students with IEPs (3B) | | | | Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C) | | | |
| Targets for FFY 2012 | 87.5 | | Reading | | Math | | Reading | | Math | |
| Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| | 48 | 55.8 | 39,898 | 99.5 | 40,386 | 99.5 | 15,523 | 38.9 | 15,252 | 37.8 |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

Actual Data for 2012-2013

| Statewide Assessment 2012-2013 | | Math Assessment Participation | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|--|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | High School | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 5,954 | 7,405 | 5,806 | 5,991 | 5,799 | 5,690 | 3,951 | 40,596 | |
| b. | IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 639 | 0 | 304 | 352 | 289 | 0 | 0 | 1,584 | 3.9 |
| c. | IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,896 | 4,961 | 3,095 | 3,062 | 2,941 | 2,856 | 3,438 | 25,249 | 62.2 |
| d. | IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards | Louisiana does not have an alternate assessment against grade-level standards. | | | | | | | | |
| e. | IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards | 0 | 1,885 | 1,832 | 2,047 | 2,043 | 2,298 | 0 | 10,105 | 24.9 |
| f. | IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 399 | 527 | 551 | 504 | 481 | 483 | 503 | 3,448 | 8.5 |
| g. | Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline | 5,934 | 7,373 | 5,782 | 5,965 | 5,754 | 5,637 | 3,941 | 40,386 | 99.5 |
| Children included in "a" but not included in the other counts above. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 20 | 32 | 24 | 26 | 45 | 53 | 10 | 210 | 0.5 |

| Statewide Assessment 2012-2013 | | Reading Assessment Participation | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | High School | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 5,952 | 7,391 | 5,796 | 5,991 | 5,797 | 5,683 | 3,493 | 40,103 | |
| b. | IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 640 | 1 | 303 | 351 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 1,583 | 3.9 |
| c. | IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,893 | 4,908 | 3,049 | 3,055 | 2,925 | 2,836 | 2,979 | 24,645 | 61.4 |
| d. | IEPs in alternate assessment | Louisiana does not have an alternate assessment against grade-level standards. | | | | | | | | |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| | against grade-level standards | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards | 0 | 1,924 | 1,866 | 2,052 | 2,060 | 2,309 | 0 | 10,211 | 25.5 |
| f. | IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 400 | 531 | 553 | 506 | 481 | 484 | 504 | 3,459 | 8.6 |
| g. | Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline | 5,933 | 7,364 | 5,771 | 5,964 | 5,754 | 5,629 | 3,483 | 39,898 | 99.4 |
| Children included in “a” but not included in the other counts above. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 19 | 27 | 25 | 27 | 43 | 54 | 10 | 205 | 0.6 |

| Statewide Assessment 2012-2013 | | Math Assessment Performance | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | High School | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 5,934 | 7,373 | 5,782 | 5,965 | 5,754 | 5,637 | 3,941 | 40,386 | |
| b. | IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 396 | 0 | 181 | 184 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 907 | 2.2 |
| c. | IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,994 | 2,464 | 1,404 | 1,242 | 1,220 | 913 | 631 | 9,868 | 24.4 |
| d. | IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards | Louisiana does not have an alternate assessment against grade-level standards. | | | | | | | | |
| e. | IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards | 0 | 469 | 442 | 462 | 560 | 317 | 0 | 2,250 | 5.6 |
| f. | IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 250 | 350 | 386 | 350 | 292 | 300 | 299 | 2,227 | 5.6 |
| g. | Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline | 2,640 | 3,283 | 2,413 | 2,238 | 2,218 | 1,530 | 930 | 15,252 | 37.8 |

| Statewide Assessment 2012-2013 | | Reading Assessment Performance | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | High School | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 5,933 | 7,364 | 5,771 | 5,964 | 5,754 | 5,629 | 3,483 | 39,898 | |
| b. | IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 361 | 0 | 170 | 186 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 849 | 2.1 |
| c. | IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,775 | 2,428 | 1,313 | 1,163 | 1,019 | 820 | 852 | 9,370 | 23.5 |
| d. | IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards | Louisiana does not have an alternate assessment against grade-level standards. | | | | | | | | |
| e. | IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards | 0 | 457 | 570 | 580 | 694 | 633 | 0 | 2,934 | 7.3 |
| f. | IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 240 | 377 | 350 | 337 | 343 | 364 | 359 | 2,370 | 5.9 |
| g. | Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline | 2,376 | 3,262 | 2,403 | 2,266 | 2,188 | 1,817 | 1,211 | 15,523 | 38.9 |

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A key component of Louisiana’s Accountability System is its statewide testing program. Louisiana tests students annually in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies in 3rd through 8th grades. The current tests, known as Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and Integrated Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (iLEAP), were developed for Louisiana. These tests include both multiple-choice questions and constructed-response items.

Students in 4th and 8th grade participate in high-stakes assessments which determine whether they are promoted to the next grade level. Tenth and 11th grade students who entered high school prior to the 2010-2011 school year participate in the Graduate Exit Examination (GEE). The End of Course Test (EOC) has replaced the GEE for graduation purposes for students entering high school after 2010. Students in third, fifth, seventh, and ninth grades participate in the iLEAP test, which is designed to measure progress but does not determine whether students will be retained in their current grade.

At this time, students with disabilities who are candidates for graduation take the GEE, EOC, or LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA2). If they pass two of the three required assessment components at *Approaching Basic* or *Above* and have met all other graduation requirements, a waiver for graduation purposes may be granted.

In 2014-2015, elementary and middle school students will take annual assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics that are aligned to higher standards. These assessments are being developed collaboratively by Louisiana and a coalition of states. Students across all of these states will be using identical assessments which will allow Louisiana to benchmark its progress against other states. In preparation for these assessments, Louisiana is including more content aligned to higher standards in LEAP and iLEAP tests in 2012-13 and in 2013-14. **The LAA 2 assessment will not be administered in elementary and middle school starting in 2014-2015.**

Currently, there are six types of assessments for Louisiana students:

1. **LEAP** is a criterion-referenced testing (CRT) program that is directly aligned with the State content standards, which by law are as rigorous as those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The LEAP measures how well students in grades 4 and 8 have mastered Louisiana content standards. There are five achievement levels: Advanced, Mastery, Basic, Approaching Basic and Unsatisfactory. A student must score at Basic or above to be considered proficient.
2. The **iLEAP** is referred to as an “integrated” LEAP because it combines a norm-referenced test, which compares a student’s test results to the performance of students in a national sample, with a criterion-referenced test that reports student results in terms of the state’s achievement levels. The iLEAP is reported in accordance with the same five achievement levels as LEAP: Mastery, Advanced, Basic, Approaching Basic, and Unsatisfactory. A student must score at Basic or above to be considered proficient.
3. **LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2)** is a criterion-reference test based on modified academic achievement standards that allows students with persistent academic difficulties who are served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) to participate in academic assessments that are sensitive to measuring progress in their learning. LAA 2 is administered in grades 4 through 8, 10, and 11. There are four levels of achievement: Basic, Approaching Basic, Foundational, and Pre-Foundational. A student must score at Approaching Basic or above to be considered proficient.
4. **LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1)** measures the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3 through 8, 10, and 11 who do not participate in general statewide assessments or the LAA 2. LAA 1 is a standardized, performance-based assessment that measures the Extended Standards, extensions of the Louisiana content standards, in three areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. Students assessed using LAA 1 receive one of the following three achievement ratings: Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard, and Working toward Standard. Students who score at the Meets Standard level and above are considered proficient.
5. **EOC tests** measure whether students have mastered the knowledge, skills, and abilities at the end of courses. The content of the assessments is based on Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs). EOC tests are required in English II, Algebra I, Geometry, and Biology. There are four achievement levels for the End-of-Course exams: Excellent, Good, Fair, and Needs Improvement. A student must score at Good or above to be considered proficient.
6. **American College Test (ACT)** - Every 8th-11th grade student in Louisiana will participate in the EXPLORE/Plan/ACT series, which will be funded by the state, beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. This series of ACT tests will serve as a guide for teachers and families as to what each high school student needs in order to be prepared to achieve at high levels.

Public Reporting Information: The LDOE, in order to protect the privacy of students in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) codified at 20 U.S.C. 1232g, does not publicly report the performance of students with disabilities at the school level. However, information on the performance of students with disabilities at the state and district level can be found at the links below:

Reports for LEAP/GEE assessments may be found at
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/test-results>

Reports for iLEAP assessments may be found at
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/test-result>

Reports for EOC assessments may be found at
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/test-results>

Reports for LAA 1 assessments may be found at
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/test-results>

Reports for LAA2 assessments may be found at

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/test-results>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 3A. 48 of 86 districts (55.81%) have a disability subgroup that met the State's AYP targets. This reflects improvement from FFY 2011 when 51.1% of the districts met AYP for the disability subgroup.

Louisiana met the target for Indicator 3B. The data improved slightly from the previous year. Participation in Reading/ELA increased .3% from 99.2% to 99.5%. Participation in Math increased .4% from 99.1% to 99.5%. These percentages represent a very high participation rate.

Louisiana did not meet the target for Indicator 3C. Data indicate 38.9% of students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scored proficient on the Reading/ELA assessment, and 37.8% of the students enrolled for a full academic year scored proficient on the Math assessment. While the target was not met, this reflects ongoing improvement from FFY 2011.

Improvement Activity 3.1 C Partner with stakeholders to collaboratively develop new statewide assessments that align with higher standards.

Discussion of Activity 3.1 C:

National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) General Supervision Enhancement Grant - The long-term goal of the NCSC partnership is to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and leave high school ready for post-secondary options. A well-designed summative assessment alone is insufficient to achieve that goal. Thus, NCSC is developing a full system intended to support educators, which includes formative assessment tools and strategies, professional development on appropriate interim uses of data for progress monitoring, and management systems to ease the burdens of administration and documentation. All partners share a commitment to the research-to-practice focus of the project and the development of a comprehensive model of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and supportive professional development. These supports will improve the alignment and strengthen the validity of the system of assessments.

Practice Assessment/Strengthen Skills (PASS) - PASS is an on-line program that allows students to practice for standardized assessments in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. New writing prompts were added for all students during this reporting cycle.

Enhanced Assessment of Grade Level Expectations (EAGLE) - EAGLE is an online assessment tool that supports formative assessments and can be used to aid student learning. Teachers construct online tests and obtain performance reports aligned to state standards.

Improvement Activity 3.1 D The LDOE will support implementation of initiatives for K-12 students that includes the design, implementation, and sustainability of improved school-wide plans for targeted schools. The plans focus on improved performance of students with disabilities using varied research-based strategies to close achievement gaps.

Discussion of Activity 3.1 D

Technology Footprint - In Louisiana, the transition to digital learning is underway. In 2014-2015, schools will administer many of their assessments and end-of-course tests online. To support school districts in the transition to technology-rich schools, the LDOE developed a technology footprint for each school district based on the data provided in their response to the Technology Readiness Tool. The technology footprint provides a snapshot of an LEA's digital readiness. Multiple technology readiness support efforts, supplemental resources, webinars, face-to-face trainings, and newsletter articles were provided to support this effort.

SRCL - In the spring of 2011, the LDOE applied for and was subsequently awarded a federal Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Grant. The grant activities are implemented via Louisiana's Literacy is for Everyone (LIFE) Promise project which is modeled after the state's highly successful K-12 Literacy Pilot Program. The needs of all students with disabilities are included in the LIFE Promise project. In 2012 the second cohort of LEAs was selected. To build capacity and promote success, subgrantees:

- Participated in the statewide SRCL Leadership Summit
- Attended the National Comprehensive Literacy Institute
- Received training on administering and interpreting literacy assessments including benchmark and progress monitoring assessments
- Participated in conference calls, e-mails, webinars, and face-to-face meetings to discuss implementation

successes and solutions to challenges

- Received assistance from network coaches who help teachers and leaders:
 - develop student learning targets and goals
 - implement data-based decision making
 - select and use curriculum materials aligned to higher standards
 - use assessment systems that include benchmarking assessments aligned to higher standards
 - implement Universal Design for Learning principles and effective use of technology to support achievement of higher standards
- Implemented the Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC) framework and participated in training:
 - Engaged in 3 leadership meetings and 3 teacher institutes
 - Used an online coaching platform to share best practices and solutions to common challenges
- Prepared presentations to share at the USDE forum highlighting effective strategies used to improve literacy outcomes
- Received training materials to prepare for a 2-day session on Professional Learning Communities

Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC) – The Literacy Design Collaborative Framework Project sponsored face-to-face meetings and webinars to assist districts with planning and implementation of higher Standards.

Capacity building included:

- 3 leadership meetings and 3 teacher institutes that addressed strategies for embedding higher standards, aligned Literacy components into content area instruction, and scaling the LDC.
- An online coaching platform to share best practices and solutions to common challenges

Race to the Top - The Race to the Top Update on implementation indicates that progress was made in all project areas. The update specifically addressed progress in the following areas: communication and collaboration, network trainings, data systems, creating strong resources, and providing training and support. This progress was attributed to several activities including the development of resources and tools to support school leaders, teachers, and parents, as well as comprehensive trainings to support implementation of Compass and transition to higher standards.

Believe and Include: The LDOE conducted a competitive grant process for schools. Requirements for acceptance included school-wide plans for design, implementation, and sustainability of building level activities focused on improved outcomes. The program provided funding to schools to develop innovative programs that help students with disabilities achieve proficiency in more rigorous standards. The program is part of *Louisiana Believes*, the state's comprehensive plan to empower educators to make decisions about instruction in the classroom.

Compass - Compass is the state's educator support and evaluation system. The system is designed to provide all educators with regular, meaningful feedback on their performance and align supports to foster continuous improvement. Under this system, every teacher and school leader in public school is evaluated annually using a four-tiered rating – Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging, and Ineffective. For teachers, half of the evaluation is based on student growth and half of the evaluation is based on observations by their supervisor using the state's Compass teacher rubric. In subjects that are tested by a state standardized assessment, student growth on such tests is used to measure student learning. In subjects that don't have a state standardized test, targets established by teachers and their evaluators are used to determine student learning.

Improvement Activity 3.6 Provide support on instruction in higher standards to school and administrative personnel through Network Support Teams.

Discussion of Activity 3.6:

Network Support Structure – The Department was reorganized to include five Network teams to serve the districts. Each Network serves between 10 and 20 school districts. This system has enabled the LDOE to work directly with districts to provide resources and tools to support school leaders in meeting the unique needs of their students. It has also allowed the LDOE to efficiently deliver Compass evaluation materials and facilitate the transition to the use of higher standards, two of the state’s most critical goals.

District Goal Setting Meetings – In an effort to ensure that all students are college or career ready, the state has eight critical goals that indicate statewide progress. LEAs were trained to use these eight critical goals each year to benchmark progress and reflect on areas of strength and improvement. The LDOE additionally provided resources focused on building district systems related to these four areas: **school leader and teacher goal-setting, assessment and curriculum, school and teacher collaboration, and observation and feedback**. Network staff partnered with districts to assess, plan for, and implement these systems. Targeted and routine meetings helped LEAs to identify a clear vision and outcomes based on district level priorities that will lead to academic improvements. Network teams supported district teams on these priorities throughout the school year.

Network Activity – Network teams identified where performance gaps between students with and without disabilities have closed in low-performing schools. Information on practices, procedures, initiatives, and manpower utilized in successful schools was gathered and shared. The initial stages of pairing schools for mentoring purposes began.

Teacher Leader Summit – This annual 2-day conference for teachers and administrators focused on aligning instruction to higher standards. During this training, participants practiced translating higher standards into effective daily lessons and instructional tasks.

Classroom Support and Family Support Toolboxes – Network team and teacher representatives developed an organized set of online resources on higher standards and college and career readiness for educators, administrators, and family members. These resources, which are found on the Department’s website, support goal setting, teacher planning, ongoing reflection and improvement activities, and other topics.

The classroom support toolbox can be found here: <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox>

The family support toolbox can be found here: <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/family-support-toolbox-library>

Improvement Activity 3.9 The LDOE will provide professional development, technical assistance, and improved correspondence to LDOE staff, LEAs, and other stakeholders on assessment procedures and appropriate provision of accommodations for students with disabilities.

Discussion for Activity 3.9:

Monthly Superintendent’s Conference Call – The Superintendent of LDOE held monthly conference calls with LEA leadership to facilitate improved communication, implement initiatives, and address concerns related to state priorities.

Teacher Leader Calls and Webinar Series – Routinely scheduled conference calls and webinars were held to improve communication with and provide support to administrators, teacher leaders, and other relevant stakeholders on issues related to higher standards and Compass transitioning.

Ed-Connect – This bi-weekly newsletter gives teachers a vital link to information, opportunities and the latest news. Most importantly, Ed-Connect includes frequent updates about the state's transition to Compass and more rigorous standards.

Improvement Activity 3.10 The LDOE will enhance accountability of internal/external data collection and reporting procedures for students with disabilities through improved internal collaboration and planning.

Discussion of Activity 3.10:

Monthly Systems Management Webinars - Monthly Data Coordinator Webinars were held for LEAs to build capacity and improve data submission outcomes. Topics included data collection, details on application enhancements, and explanations on coding and table changes.

Accountability Webinars – Webinars were held to assist districts in reviewing school performance reports and to provide information about School Performance Scores and School Letter Grades.

Weekly Collaboration Sessions – Multiple offices at LDOE, including key staff from the Office of Student Programs, Data Management representatives, and other key stakeholders, meet twice each month to discuss and clarify data requests and plan for dissemination of information.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22)]

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include state’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 4A=7.0% |
| (Data from 2011-12) | 4B=0% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

4A: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion

| Year | Total Number of LEAs | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies | Percent |
|-------------|----------------------|--|---------|
| FFY 2011-12 | 136 | 34 | 25.0% |

4B: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion that were found to be a result of inappropriate practices, policies and procedures

| Year | Total Number of LEAs | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies | Percent |
|-------------|----------------------|--|---------|
| FFY 2011-12 | 136 | 7 | 5.0% |

For Indicator 4A, the state has defined significant discrepancy as the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Since the state uses percentages, there is no minimum “n” size. Thus, all districts were included in the calculation. For the FFY 2012, the state average was .75. Thus, any district whose percentage was greater than 1.13% was identified as significantly discrepant.

For Indicator 4B, the state defined significant discrepancy for a particular race/ethnicity as the percent of all students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days at a rate 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Additionally, in order to be significantly discrepant, there had to be more than 1 student in the race/ethnic group. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was .75. Thus, any race/ethnic group whose percentage was greater than 1.13%, and who had more than 1 student represented in the race/ethnic group, was considered significantly discrepant.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 4A. Thirty-four (24.1%) of the districts were found to be discrepant in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for all students with disabilities. After a review of district policies, procedures, and practices, LDOE determined that none of the 34 districts’ discrepancies were the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. Therefore, LDOE did not change, or require the districts to change, their policies, procedures, or practices.

Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 4B. Twenty one districts were found to be discrepant with respect to race/ethnicity. The districts determined to be discrepant were required to review and, if necessary, revise their policies, procedures, and practices to determine whether these contributed to the significant discrepancy or failed to comply with the procedural safeguards of IDEA. Following a review of the policies, procedures, and practices of each of the 21 districts, 7 of the 136 districts (5%) were found to be discrepant due to inappropriate or insufficient policies, procedures, or practices.

Those seven districts were required to submit to the LDOE a plan of action. The plan of action addresses the cause and frequency of the noncompliance, the tasks or steps developed to resolve the noncompliance, the personnel responsible for the tasks, and the targeted completion date. Additionally, each plan of action includes a plan for monitoring that comprises the steps taken to ensure that the inappropriate or insufficient policies, procedures, or practices have been resolved.

Improvement Activity 4.1

Targeted Assistance through web-based training:

1. LDOE will provide professional development and materials through various web-based programs.
2. Districts identified as being discrepant will have available the requirements of the State’s BESE Model Master Discipline Plan pursuant to the requirements of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act 1225 (2003) to ensure that positive behavior supports are being implemented with fidelity.
3. A revised self-review instrument, previously developed by the Louisiana State University (LSU) Positive Behavior and Interventions Support (PBIS) Project, will be required of all discrepant districts (4A and 4B).

Discussion of Activity 4.1

1. Districts rely on their Network teams to deliver targeted technical assistance in the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
2. The BESE model is made available to districts upon request.
3. Discrepant districts were required to use a self-review instrument to review and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions, and procedural safeguards and submit a report to the LDOE.

Improvement Activity 4.2

Critical Data Analysis:

1. LDOE will analyze data for this indicator across all districts to identify districts for 1) further data review, 2) data verification, and 3) technical assistance.
2. Critical data analysis to examine the types of incidents that occur within significantly discrepant districts to guide the self-review process and identify the types of professional development opportunities that need to be offered.

Discussion of Activity 4.2

LDOE critically examined the suspension and expulsion data for 2011-2012 and has initiated plans to address results. The Network teams will continue to support LEAs and provide opportunities for professional development and technical assistance.

Improvement Activity 4.4

LDOE will develop and implement a data verification review for ensuring that data for this indicator are accurate.

Discussion of Activity 4.4

The data and measurements for this indicator were verified by the LDOE data team and reviewed by multiple LDOE staff for accuracy.

Improvement Activity 4.6

The LDOE through its eight PBIS consortiums will continue to implement the intensive version of the Prevent-Teach-Reinforce (PTR) PBIS tertiary model, including requiring in each consortium’s “Scope of Work” specified requirements that PTR trainings be offered to all districts. Districts targeted will include discrepant districts.

Discussion of Activity 4.6

The statewide PBIS initiative continued to be the driving force and methodology that Louisiana used for addressing the requirements of Indicator 4. During the 2012-13 school year, 120 PBIS training sessions were conducted throughout the state. Building on the infrastructure of support established through the regional consortium structures, each district has had access to trainings focused on increasing its capacity for addressing challenging behavior.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Indicator 5-A | Indicator 5-B | Indicator 5-C |
| 2012 (Data from 2011-2012) | 62.5% | 12.5% | 1.8% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Indicator 5-A | Indicator 5-B | Indicator 5-C |
| 2012 (Data from 2011-2012) | 62.4% | 14.02% | 1.33% |

Calculations:

| Educational Environments | October, 2012 | | Calculations |
|--|---------------|---------|--------------------|
| | Number | Percent | |
| Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; | 42,287 | 62.4% | 42,287/67,763 X100 |
| Inside the regular class less | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-------|--------|--------------------|
| than 40% of the day; | 9,499 | 14.02% | 9,499/67,763 X 100 |
| In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 898 | 1.33% | 898/67,763 X 100 |

Source: 618 data (Part B, IDEA Implementation of FAPE Requirement, Educational Environment of Children with Disabilities Ages 6-21) October 1, 2012

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Louisiana met one of the three targets. Louisiana both met and exceeded the target for 5C (1.8%) with a percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 who are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements at **1.33%**.

Louisiana was very close to meeting the target for 5A. The target for 5A was **62.5%**, and the actual performance was **62.4%**. Although Louisiana did not meet the goal for Indicator 5A, there was an increase of 1.2 percentage points in the children who are served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day from 61.2 % to 62.4%.

Louisiana did not meet the target for 5B. The target for 5B was **12.0%**, and the actual performance slipped from **13.7%** to **14.02%**. For Indicator 5B, there was a decrease of 0.52 percentage points in the children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 who were inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.

Improvement Activity 5.2 Establish a coherent professional development plan to create collaborative school cultures. This will be planned and implemented by a cross-department team representing multiple divisions. Participants, framework, and content are all addressed.

Discussion of Activity 5.2:

Multiple efforts/structures are in place to support a coherent professional development plan through the Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant (LaSPDG).

- Efforts were expanded in 2012-2013 to infuse the needs of students with disabilities throughout the transition to higher standards. Network teams provided professional development (PD) and technical assistance to LEAs throughout the state in the transition to higher standards.
- LaSPDG provided several opportunities for PD that focused on improved outcomes for students with disabilities. LaSPDG PD activities included: on-site support, consultations, the creation and presentation of nine webinars, and bi-annual opportunities for districts to share evidence-based practices via regional meetings. PD provided by LaSPDG focused on Co-Teaching, Inclusive Principles, Progress Monitoring, and Universal Design for Learning.
- Additionally LaSPDG, focused on culturally responsive teaching and discipline techniques, family engagement, and diversity.

Placement related outcomes for 2012-2013 LaSPDG districts are as follows:

- 54% of LaSPDG districts are above the state average for placement of students with disabilities in general education classrooms more than 80% of the day.
- 54% of LaSPDG districts were also below the state average for students with disabilities in general education placement less than 40% of the school day.
- 73% of LaSPDG districts are below the state average for students with disabilities in separate schools and facilities.

The LDOE continued funding for the LASARD (Louisiana Autism Spectrum and Related Disorders) Project. The goals of the project are (a) to improve educational practices and outcomes for students with autism spectrum disorders (ASD) and related disabilities, and (b) to develop statewide capacity to provide high-quality educational programs for these students. This project provided PD and TA on evidence-based practices for students with autism and other related disorders, with an emphasis on the provision of services in the least restrictive environment.

LASARD PD includes online modules on a variety of topics, face-to-face workshops, online monthly workgroups, and a summer institute which focuses on inclusive practices. The LASARD website and resources are available to serve personnel from schools across the state. LASARD facilitators provide regular onsite technical support to registered district’s school-based teams to support their efforts to implement action plans and become high quality demonstration programs.

Improvement Activity 5.4: Expand efforts to infuse the needs of students with disabilities within the context of the following existing initiatives:

- 1) General education literacy/reading programs at the state, district, and building levels

2) Provision of alternate instructional materials for students with print disabilities

Discussion of Activity 5.4:

Extensive work related to this activity has continued.

1) In the spring of 2011, the LDOE applied for and was subsequently awarded a federal Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Grant. The grant activities are implemented via Louisiana’s Literacy is for Everyone (LIFE) Promise project which is modeled after the state’s highly successful K-12 Literacy Pilot Program. The needs of all students with disabilities are included in the LIFE Promise project.

In 2012, the second cohort of LEAs was selected. To build capacity and promote success, subgrantees:

- Participated in the statewide SRCL Leadership Summit
- Attended the National Comprehensive Literacy Institute
- Received training on administering and interpreting literacy assessments including benchmark and progress monitoring assessments
- Participated in conference calls, e-mails, webinars, and face-to-face meetings to discuss implementation successes and solutions to challenges
- Received assistance from network coaches who help teachers and leaders:
 - develop student learning targets and goals
 - implement data-based decision making
 - select and use curriculum materials aligned to higher standards
 - use assessment systems that include benchmarking assessments aligned to the higher standards
 - implement Universal Design for Learning principles and effective use of technology to support achievement of higher standards
- Implemented the Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC) framework and participated in training:
 - Engaged in 3 leadership meetings and 3 teacher institutes
 - Used an online coaching platform to share best practices and solutions to common challenges
- Prepared presentations to share at the USDE forum highlighting effective strategies used to improve literacy outcomes
- Received training materials to prepare for a 2-day session on Professional Learning Communities

2) As part of the overall effort to improve accessibility for students with disabilities, Louisiana continues to integrate programs for Assistive Technology (AT). The LDOE funds five Assistive Technology (AT) Regional centers that provide professional development, consultations, and technical assistance to improve the capacity of districts to provide their own AT structures. The LDOE state consultants also provide professional development and guidance throughout the year.

For more information about Louisiana’s AT and AIM Initiative, visit:

- [Southeast](#)
- [South River](#)
- [Northwest](#)

3) This year the LDOE wrapped up its active involvement in Speech and Language Support for All (SALSA), an initiative to improve academic outcomes for students through varied and improved service delivery models implemented by speech-language pathologists (SLPs) in schools. By emphasizing collaboration with classroom teachers and other educators, providing more classroom-based and integrated services, and focusing on curriculum-relevant skills, the support that SLPs provide to students is enhanced. The 100 SLP Cadre Leaders continue to assist in local and systemic capacity building efforts.

- The LDOE, in collaboration with Louisiana State University (LSU), developed an alternative Compass Professional Practice Evaluation Rubric that aligns closely with the Louisiana Teacher Rubric and rigorous state standards. LEAs have the option of adopting this rubric for evaluations of speech-language pathologists.
- The collaborative SALSA Development Site Project between LDOE, LSU, and East Baton Rouge Parish School System ended in June. Results and data were shared in the third presentation of its type at the American Speech-Language Hearing Association national convention.

4) The department’s five Network teams work directly with districts to set goals for the classroom, observe classroom practices, and provide support for all students, including students with disabilities.

Improvement Activity 5.5 Establish a long-term “Think Tank” committee to support the effort to identify, develop, implement, and evaluate recruitment and retention models that blend state and local resources. Identify funding sources to recruit, retain, and support skilled personnel.

Discussion of Activity 5.5: Although the “Think Tank” committee is no longer in existence, recruitment and retention efforts continue as noted below.

- 1) The LDOE operates the Teach Louisiana! website (<http://teachlouisiana.net/>) as a means of providing a one-stop shop for information regarding teacher certification, preparation, and recruitment in the state. Via this site, teachers can gain information about certification requirements and certification programs, submit job applications on-line, and be matched with districts where positions are available. LDOE also operates Teach Louisiana! Facebook and Twitter pages, on which services and news updates related to the site are promoted through regular postings.
- 2) As part of the Teach Louisiana! website, the LDOE offers a free recruitment service called the “Workforce Talent Recruitment Service” that matches certified leaders and teachers who meet the requirements for certification and highly qualified status to districts with openings. This works to ensure higher academic achievement for all students, eliminate achievement gaps, and prepare students to either attain a college degree or pursue a professional career. The Louisiana Department of Education’s *Talent Recruitment System* is a free, web-based service that pairs job-seeking educators with Louisiana districts/schools seeking to hire them. To join the *Talent Recruitment System*, one must first create an employment profile. After creating an employment profile, the individual is able to notify specific districts of his or her interest in working there. Additionally, as the profile preferences match to specific job vacancies posted to the Teach LA website, the individual will receive automated email notifications informing him/her of these job opportunities. When the candidate notifies a district of his/her interest in working there, as well as when his/her profile matches to a job vacancy, his/her employment profile will become viewable to that particular hiring authority.
- 3) The LDOE’s Statewide Staffing Initiative (LSSI) was developed to assist low-performing schools in selected districts to build strong instructional teams and open the school year fully staffed. The initiative, run in partnership with The New Teacher Project, is giving principals the tools and support they need to hire top talent - a key to raising student achievement.
- 4) In 2012-2013, a one-day summer institute was held for Human Resource (HR) directors and School Leaders across the state. This institute addressed best hiring/staffing practices. Individualized training was also held for the HR staff and principals of one public school district.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|---|
| 2012 | Measurement A Measurable and Rigorous Target = 25% Measurement B Measurable and Rigorous Target = 3.0% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

The data for the FFY 2012 is reported below in the chart and the new targets for this Indicator were set based on the data from FFY 2011.

Measurement Table:

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Measurement A | A1 = 2,364 | A1 + B1 = 2,451 | 2451 / 10,227 = 0.239 x 100 = | 23.9% |
| | B1 = 87 | | | |
| Measurement B | C1 = 311 | C1 + C2 + C3 = 330 | 330 / 10,227 = 0.032 x100 = | 3.2% |
| | C2 = 18 | | | |
| | C3 = 1 | | | |
| Total number of 3-5 year olds w/ IEPs | 10,227 | | | |

A1= The # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program **at least** 10 hours per week and receiving a majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

B1= The # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program **less than** 10 hours per week and receiving a majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

- C1= Special Education Classroom
- C2= Separate School
- C3= Residential Facility

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012:

Louisiana did not meet the two targets set for Indicator 6. The target for Measurement A was **25.0%** and the actual state performance was **23.9%**. The target for Measurement B was **3.0%** and the actual state performance was **3.2%**.

Louisiana has worked very hard with the local school districts to reduce the percentage of children with disabilities who attend separate settings for education. The school districts have been successful with their efforts to include children with disabilities in the general early childhood programs. However, their efforts to provide a majority of services in the general early childhood programs still need to improve. Therefore, the targets for Measurement A and Measurement B will remain the same as the targets for last year.

The following improvement activities illustrate the efforts Louisiana has taken to continue to improve on the targets for Indicator 6:

Improvement Activity 6.1: The LDOE supports engagements with SpecialQuest to assist two selected districts with options and recommended practices to facilitate more inclusive practices for children with disabilities in general education programs. SpecialQuest provides support, training, coaching, and facilitation to increase preschool inclusion and improve the quality of services provided in inclusive settings.

Discussion of Activity 6.1:

NOTE: At the beginning, two school systems were chosen for the project, however, once the process began, one of the school districts asked not to participate. Only one school district remained in the project moving forward.

Beginning in FFY 2011, the LDOE provided funds for an Inclusion Project with SpecialQuest (SQ) in order to assist a school district in moving their early childhood special education service options to be more inclusive and meet the requirements of IDEA. The project design for Year One allowed SQ consultants to study and report on the placement of children in Early Childhood Special Education Programs in the Lafayette Parish School System. The consultants worked collaboratively with the district planning team to develop an individualized inclusion restructuring action plan. The SQ consultants provided a comprehensive written report of their findings that included specific recommendations for program restructuring/improvement.

During Year 2 of the Inclusion Project (FFY 2012), the SQ consultants supported the Lafayette Parish School System with assistance in cross-agency collaboration (school system, child care, and Head Start), mentoring for general and special education teachers, and training for all the collaborative partners and parents using the SpecialQuest model of inclusion. Additional activities of the Inclusion Project:

- Provided mentoring, training, follow-up support, and meetings to implement Lafayette Parish action plans for inclusive preschool services.
- Conducted quarterly site visits and regularly scheduled conference calls with the Lafayette Preschool Inclusion Team to coach and support the effective implementation of the inclusion action plans.
- Monitored and documented the progress of Lafayette Parish's efforts to implement inclusion restructuring and report progress to the LDOE.
- Provided ongoing problem solving and support to the Lafayette Parish Early Childhood Inclusion Team.

The efforts of the Inclusion Project with SpecialQuest and Lafayette Parish School System have been very successful. Over the past two years, Lafayette Parish School System has:

- Significantly increased the number of preschool children with disabilities placed in general early childhood inclusive settings from approximately 52 to 103.
- More than doubled the number of children with disabilities placed in LA 4 reverse mainstream classrooms (19 in 2011-12, 41 in 2012-13).
- Increased the special education services that children with disabilities are receiving in over 16 different preschool and childcare programs in the community (no children received special education services in childcare settings in 2011-12).
- Continued to serve children with disabilities in five Head Start sites across the parish.
- Increased the confidence of Special Education teachers and therapists in inclusion practices.

Due to the success of the project, the school district requested to continue the project for a third year, and the funds were allocated for the continuation for FFY 2013.

Improvement Activity 6.2: The LDOE conducts an annual Preschool and Kindergarten Conference. The conference highlights breakout sessions geared toward special education preschool staff to inform them of best practices for integrating and maintaining participation of preschool children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Discussion of Activity 6.2:

This activity has been discontinued. LDOE has established staff as IDEA Points of Contact (POC) to provide direct support and technical assistance to LEAs. Further, the Network teams also work directly with LEA staff to provide information on best practices.

Improvement Activity 6.3: The LDOE conducts visits to early childhood classrooms across the state. A research-based environmental preschool rating scale is used by the LDOE for evaluation of all preschool programs, including an analysis of the extent that children with disabilities are included in general PreK class activities.

Discussion of Activity 6.3:

Each year the LDOE chooses a sampling of preschool classrooms to visit throughout the school year to determine the appropriateness and quality of the programs. These visits are also used to determine the extent to which districts are including children with disabilities in the general preschool programs. Exit conferences with the teacher, coordinator, and/or principal are conducted at the end of each classroom visit, and strengths of the program as well as recommendations for improvement are discussed at each conference.

Improvement Activity 6.4: The LDOE facilitates a three-year grant to conduct the Louisiana Early Education Program (LEEP) Institute to allow students and teachers to take college courses needed to become certified in Early Intervention and work with children 3-5 years of age who have disabilities.

Discussion of Activity 6.4:

The LDOE has worked diligently to ensure that highly qualified teachers are placed in all classrooms and that a developmentally appropriate curriculum is followed. Since 1982, the LDOE has issued a grant through the Request for Applications (RFA) process to conduct the Louisiana Early Education Program (LEEP) Institute. The purpose of the grant is to increase opportunities for students and teachers to take coursework toward certification in Early Intervention. The LEEP Institute is held on a college/university campus and offers two, week-long, on-site courses and one or two online courses for university credit toward certification in Early Intervention. The students and teachers that participate are provided stipends to offset the cost of the courses required for certification in Early Intervention.

In the summer of 2012, an RFA for funds to provide the LEEP Summer Institute was released and two universities were awarded the grant to provide the Early Intervention summer courses beginning in the summer of 2013. The two universities (Southeastern Louisiana and Nicholls State) were awarded \$125,000 for each year of the three-year grant. Both of these universities are in South Louisiana and part of the grant requires them to partner with a university in North Louisiana. Southeastern partnered with University of Louisiana at Monroe and Nicholls partnered with Louisiana Tech University in Ruston.

At the end of Year One, Southeastern/UL Monroe had 40 participants from 14 different parishes successfully complete their enrolled courses. Nicholls/LaTech had 32 participants successfully complete their enrolled courses.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $[\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c.) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d.)} \div [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a.) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b.) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c.) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d.)}] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = $[\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d.) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (e.)} \div \text{the total } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress categories (a.) + (b.) + (c.) + (d.) + (e.)}] \times 100$.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--|
| 2012 | Targets for Outcome A: A1 – 63.5% A2 – 68.0% Targets for Outcome B: B1 – 63.5% B2 – 58.0% Targets for Outcome C: C1 – 71.0% C2 – 74.5% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| Outcomes and Summary Statements | FFY 2012 State Actual % | FFY 2012 State Target % |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 73.06% | 63.5% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. | 65.16% | 68.0% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 73.24% | 63.5% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. | 57.89% | 58.0% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 77.49% | 71.0% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. | 69.88% | 74.5% |

Progress Category Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2012

Note: Percent totals in this table were calculated by the AEPSi reporting tool and, because of rounding, may not equal 100%.

| | A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | | B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | | C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | |
|---|--|---------------|--|---------------|---|---------------|
| | # of children | % of children | # of children | % of children | # of children | % of children |
| a. Children who did not improve functioning | 57 | 1.39% | 60 | 1.46% | 47 | 1.15% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 738 | 17.98% | 811 | 19.76% | 608 | 14.81% |
| c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 635 | 15.47% | 857 | 20.88% | 581 | 14.16% |
| d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,521 | 37.06% | 1,527 | 37.21% | 1,674 | 40.79% |
| e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,153 | 28.09% | 849 | 20.69% | 1,194 | 29.09% |
| Total | 4,104 | 100.00% | 4,104 | 100.00% | 4,104 | 100.00% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Summary Statement 1 - Increasing the rate of growth for children during their time in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)

Analyses of outcome data for FFY 2012 indicate that Louisiana exceeded the targets for substantially increasing the rate of growth of children exiting ECSE services in all outcome areas. Results surpassed targets and demonstrated statistically significant growth from the prior year for positive social emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs.

Summary Statement 2 - Children functioning within age expectations upon exit from ECSE

FFY 2012 data for each of the outcome areas show that the state fell short of its targets for the percent of children functioning within age expectations at exit. However, analyses of the data indicate state improvement in positive social emotional skills and acquisition as well as use of knowledge and skills. Performance results for use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs improved only slightly over the past two years.

Improvement Activity 7.3 B: *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS – R)* evaluations of preschool programs, including assessment of the extent that children with disabilities participate in all class activities.

Discussion of Activity 7.3 B:

Numerous PreK programs that included children with disabilities were visited across that state during the 2012-13 school year. These PreK programs were evaluated using the *ECERS* as a quality assessment instrument for program improvement. LDOE provided assistance where needs were determined to be the greatest.

Improvement Activity 7.3 C: Provide in-service to districts to instruct staff on the use of the AEPSi.

Discussion of Activity 7.3 C:

Since there is ongoing staff turnover in local districts, there remains a need for AEPSi data entry training. Brookes Publishing Company has conducted a series of webinars that included an introduction/refresher to the system, reporting features, and administrator concerns. The webinar recordings are available for all users. Tutorials and tips that are specific to data entry for OSEP reporting are also available at the AEPSi web site. The opportunity to attend a face-to-face meeting was offered to all participants in September 2012.

Improvement Activity 7.3 D: Update meetings for special education supervisors, preschool coordinators, and Part C state and regional staff are held each year during the fall and spring in various parts of the state to discuss early childhood issues and concerns.

Discussion of Activity 7.3 D:
This improvement activity has been discontinued. LDOE’s IDEA Points of Contact (POC) and the Network teams work directly with LEA staff.

Improvement Activity 7.3 E: Individualized technical assistance for each district relative to AEPSi data entry.

Discussion of Activity 7.3 E:
LDOE staff review AEPSi data each quarter for accuracy. Districts are contacted and assistance is provided when data errors are identified. Additionally, technical assistance is provided to each district on an “on demand” basis by telephone and via email.

Improvement Activity 7.3 F: LDOE representative will attend the Early Childhood Outcomes Conference in September 2012.

Discussion of Activity 7.3 F:
An LDOE preschool staff member attended the annual NECTAC ECO Conference to stay informed of current issues and gather information to be communicated to local districts.

Improvement Activity 7.4: (Addition) Develop a Unified Early Childhood System of Local Networks.

Discussion of Activity 7.4:
During 2012-13, Louisiana began developing a unified Early Childhood System of Local Networks, as directed by **Act 3** of the 2012 Regular Legislative Session. When fully implemented in 2015-2016, the networks will expand access to high quality, publicly-funded, early childhood programs to families across Louisiana to ensure more children enter school ready for kindergarten. Multiple early childhood programs that operate with public funds, including pre-kindergarten in public schools (LA 4, 8g, Title I, IDEA), the Nonpublic School Early Childhood Development Program (NSECD), Head Start, Early Head Start, EarlySteps, and the Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP), will operate within a unified system, with consistent standards for administration, learning, funding, and professional development requirements. Through this unified system, the state is working to ensure that early childhood professionals demonstrate progress on assessments of teacher/child interactions and instruction, infant-to-age-five children demonstrate growth on child assessments, every at-risk four-year-old is enrolled in a program by fall 2015, and more at-risk infant-to-age-five children are served in high-quality inclusive settings by spring 2015. This project is expected to improve the percent of children functioning within age expectations by exit from the preschool program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:

Targets for Summary Statements One and Two will remain the same for Outcomes A, B, and C for FFY 2013.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 45% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

36% of respondents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children.

[(474 parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by (the total of 1,331 respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100. (474 ÷ 1,331 x 100 = 36%)

In FFY 2012, there were 21,077 surveys mailed to parents, and 1,331 surveys with valid data were returned for a return rate of 6.3 %.

Prior data show that the percent of parents meeting the indicator standard increased from 31% in FFY 2007 to 36% in FFY 2008 and 39% in FFY 2009, followed by a decrease in FFY 2010 to 32%. FFY 2011 shows a gain of two percentage points, up to 34%. An increase in FFY 2012 shows a gain of two percentage points to 36%.

We can report a gain of two percentage points for FFY 2012. Of the 21,077 surveys mailed, 2,358 (8.9%) were returned to the LDOE by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable. In an attempt to improve our response rate, LDOE amended our contract with Scantron to include a web-based survey. Instructions to complete the web-based survey were included in the survey cover letter that was mailed to parents. 145 families chose to complete the web-based survey.

School Year 2012-2013 Parent Survey Results:

| Race/Ethnicity | Total Number Returning Survey | Number at or above the Standard Value of 600 | Percentage at or above the Standard Value of 600 | 95% Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 15 | 7 | 47% | 22% - 72% |
| Black/African American | 475 | 180 | 38% | 34% - 42% |
| Asian | 4 | 1 | 25% | 17% - 67% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20 | 8 | 40% | 19% - 61% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0% - 0% |
| Two or More Races | 18 | 2 | 11% | -3% - 25% |
| White | 798 | 276 | 35% | 32% - 38% |

Total Count = 1,331

| Percentage of Parents at or above Standard Score by Grade Category | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Grade Category | Total Number Returning Survey | Number at or above the Standard Value of 600 | Percentage at or above the Standard Value of 600 | 95% Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage |
| Pre-Kindergarten | 216 | 78 | 36% | 30% – 42% |
| Kindergarten – Grade 5 | 610 | 219 | 36% | 32% – 40% |
| Grades 6 – 8 | 262 | 93 | 36% | 30% – 42% |
| Grades 9 – 12 | 243 | 84 | 35% | 29% – 41% |

Total Count = 1,331

| Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS) Participation Survey Items Ranked According to Frequency of Agreement Responses – From Highest to Lowest Agreement | | | Parent |
|--|--|--|--------|
| Item # | Parent Survey Item | Percent of Parents who Agree, Strongly Agree, or Very Strongly Agree | |
| 16 | Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage. | 94% | |
| 4 | At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need. | 92% | |
| 9 | My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand. | 92% | |
| 10 | Written information I receive is written in an understandable way. | 92% | |
| 5 | All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP | 89% | |
| 11 | Teachers are available to speak with me. | 89% | |
| 1 | I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program. | 87% | |
| 12 | Teachers treat me as a team member. | 86% | |
| 18 | The school has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions. | 86% | |
| 15 | Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process. | 84% | |
| 17 | Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards. | 84% | |
| 14 | Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities. | 83% | |
| 13 | Teachers and administrators seek out parent input. | 80% | |
| 19 | The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals. | 80% | |
| 22 | The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers. | 79% | |
| 23 | The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education. | 79% | |
| 3 | At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments. | 78% | |
| 20 | The school gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs. | 77% | |
| 6 | Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services. | 72% | |
| 8 | I have been asked for my opinion about how well the special education services my child receives are meeting my child's needs. | 72% | |
| 25 | The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school. | 70% | |
| 24 | The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school. | 62% | |

| Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS) | | Parent |
|--|---|--|
| Participation Survey Items Ranked According to Frequency of Agreement Responses – From Highest to Lowest Agreement | | |
| Item # | Parent Survey Item | Percent of Parents who Agree, Strongly Agree, or Very Strongly Agree |
| 7 | I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities. | 58% |
| 21 | The school offers parents training about special education issues. | 51% |
| 2 | I was offered special assistance (such as child care) so that I could participate in the IEP meeting. | 48% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state did not meet its target for Indicator 8.

Improvement Activity 8.1 Families Helping Families Resource Centers (FHF) will promote collaboration between families and local education agencies (LEAs) to address issues resulting in improvement(s) in school curriculum, school environment, and improved professional partnerships through ongoing communication, referral and staff collaboration.

A. Families Helping Families Resource Centers will hold a minimum of six parent/educator training sessions per school year on topics such as: increasing meaningful parental involvement in all aspects of school activities and environments, least restrictive environment, IEP/program development, communication, assessment decisions, and transition.

B. Two of the training sessions will be presented in cooperation with at least one LEA in each of the regions.

C. Families Helping Families Resource Centers will each hold one major parent/educator program targeting a minimum of 26 individuals.

Discussion of Activity 8.1 A: Sixty-eight FHF workshops impacting 1,061 individuals with disabilities, parents, and educators were conducted statewide by the ten regional resource centers. These workshops were advertised in the centers' newsletters and through cooperating community organizations; there were no fees charged to workshop participants.

Discussion of Activity 8.1 B: Each of the ten FHF centers worked collaboratively with their regional LEAs. In addition to the workshops discussed in 8.1A, the ten centers conducted forty workshops for 790 individuals with disabilities, parents and educators on transition for adolescents from school to post-school activities, independent living, and employment. Transition Specialists, who are employed a minimum of 24 hours per week at the centers, worked closely with LEAs as members of Core Transition Teams and as participants in agency fairs for individuals with disabilities and their families. The Transition Specialists represented individuals with disabilities and their families at 54 Core Team meetings.

Discussion of Activity 8.1 C: The ten resource centers conducted 10 conferences targeting the needs of individuals with disabilities, their families, and education professionals. Statewide, 611 individuals participated in these parent conferences.

Improvement Activity 8.2 Families Helping Families Resource Centers will each provide LEAs, education organizations/agencies, community agencies, and concerned individuals with information and support regarding academic/vocational/social issues relative to students with disabilities.

A. Families Helping Families Resource Centers will each provide indirect support and resource materials for IEP, transition, and post-secondary academic/vocational opportunities to families, caregivers and educators by maintaining/upgrading family information resource centers.

B. Families Helping Families Resource Centers will each provide direct support and information to families, caregivers and educators.

Discussion of 8.2 A: The ten family resource centers had toll-free and local telephone numbers, fax numbers, and websites available for use by members of the community seeking information about IDEA. There was an unduplicated count of 728,579 contacts statewide. The ten family resource centers maintained lending libraries which included special education/disability related pamphlets, brochures, books, audio-visual aids/equipment, and computer generated research. There were 98,561 library materials disseminated.

Discussion of 8.2 B: The ten family resource centers each employed an Educational Facilitator for the purpose of providing direct support and information to students with disabilities, their parents, and education professionals. Educational Facilitators accompanied families to IEP meetings, Facilitators explained the IEP process, and modeled appropriate and effective practices. There were 26,033 contacts where the Educational Facilitators and other FHF staff provided support for students with disabilities, their parents, and education professionals.

Improvement Activity 8.3 Families Helping Families Resource Centers will provide support/training to teacher education programs at post-secondary institutions by providing information and making training available in university-level classes on the importance of meaningful parental involvement in the provision of a free appropriate public education for students with disabilities.

A. FHF centers will establish and maintain a vital, collaborative working relationship with institutions of higher learning including regular communication on events and training opportunities. FHF centers will provide staff to make presentations and/or provide special education/disability-related information to institutions of higher learning.

Discussion of 8.3 A: The ten family resource centers collaborated with the institutions of higher education in their regions and provided presentations from an advocate’s perspective to regular and/or special education undergraduate students. Twenty of these presentations to 331 college /university students were documented during the reporting cycle.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C)]

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2012, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d) (3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum “n” size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2012 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2013. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 0% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Total Number of Districts | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification | Percent of Districts |
|------|---------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| 2012 | 149 | 5 | 0 | 0% |

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

The LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for overrepresentation. The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from October 1, 2012 Child Count Data for the FFY 2012 APR submission. Thirty (30) school districts were excluded from calculations because they did not meet the minimum “n” size of (25) in designated race or ethnicity category. All other LEAs in the state met the minimum “n” size for at least one race or ethnicity category because the number of students with disabilities in that category exceeded (25).

Determining Inappropriate Identification:

The Disproportionality Review Rubric is a tool designed to assist LEAs in the identification of inappropriate practices, policies, and procedures. The rubric allows LEAs to identify practices that may lead to inappropriate disability-based

identification of students. Specific areas include professional development and teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All LEAs found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups receiving special education and related services were required to complete the self-review to determine if the disproportionality was a result of inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures.

Determination of non-compliance with this indicator is a two-step process. The first step involves examining each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. The second step involves determining whether or not identified disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, or procedures.

LEAs found to have disproportionate representation in any areas were asked to conduct a review and complete a Disproportionality Self-Review Rubric to address whether or not policies, procedures, and practices may have influence on this status. No disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification was found during FFY 2012.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state met its target for Indicator 9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C)]

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2012, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum “n” size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2012, i.e., after June 30, 2013. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

| | |
|------------|---------------------------------------|
| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
| 2012 | 0% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Total Number of Districts | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation | Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in specific disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification | Percent of Districts |
|------|---------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| 2012 | 149 | 33 | 0 | 0% |

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

The LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for overrepresentation. The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from October 1, 2012 Child Count Data for the FFY 2012 APR submission. Thirty (30) school districts were excluded from calculations because they did not meet the minimum “n” size of (25) in designated race or ethnicity category. All other LEAs in the state met the minimum “n” size for at least one race or ethnicity category because the number of students with disabilities in that category exceeded (25).

Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

The Disproportionality Review Rubric is a tool designed to assist LEAs in the identification of inappropriate practices, policies, and procedures. The rubric allows LEAs to identify practices that may lead to inappropriate disability-based identification of students. Specific areas include professional development and teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All LEAs found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in any of the following six specific disability categories (Autism, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Other Health Impairment, and Speech or Language Impairment) were required to complete the self-review to determine if the disproportionality was a result of inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures.

Determination of non-compliance with this indicator is a two-step process. The first step involves examining each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. The second step involves determining whether or not identified disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, or procedures.

LEAs found to have disproportionate representation in any areas were asked to conduct a review and complete a Disproportionality Self-Review Rubric to address whether or not policies, procedures, and practices may have influence on this status. No disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification was found during FFY 2012.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state met its target for Indicator 10.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Measurement:

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a. but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = (b. divided by a.) times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 100% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, 98.44% of students with parental consent to evaluate received their initial individual evaluations within State required timelines.

| CHILD FIND | |
|--|---------------|
| a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received | 13,938 |
| b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days | 13,720 |
| Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or state established-timeline) [Percent = (b.) divided by (a.) times 100] | 98.44% |

All data reported for Indicator 11 is reported using the Special Education Reporting System (SER) for the 2012-2013 school year. Evaluation timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed Parental Consent-to-Evaluate form. SER has a series of system edits that aid in ensuring data accuracy, including a calendar that may be generated for calculations of 30, 45, and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.

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

1. Gather data from SER after the end of the 2012-2013 school year.
2. Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and offer them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. Identify LEAs who have cases of non-compliance.
4. Conduct outreach to IDEA directors; provide them with the names of students whose evaluations exceeded the 60-day timelines in the absence of an approved extension.
5. LEAs that were identified as non-compliant submit a plan of action that indicates the reason for the non-compliance, a description of what could have been done to keep the evaluation compliant, a list of actions taken to ensure non-compliance will not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.
6. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after noncompliance is identified.
7. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

Instances of Non-Compliance

Results of an annual data run on August 1, 2013, revealed that 187 initial evaluations statewide were not completed within 60 days or within state established timelines. All of the cases were subsequently completed.

Range of days beyond the timeline and reasons for delays:

The number of days the LEAs completed evaluations outside of the 60-day timeframe ranged from 1-191 days. Reasons for delay stated by LEAs included: inaccurate data entry, miscalculation of evaluation dates, delayed reports from outside agencies, and delayed receipt of medical documents.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state did not meet its target for Indicator 11, but will continue to implement improvement activities.

Improvement Activity 11.6 Continue to reduce the number of extensions allowed on initial evaluations. Review quarterly SER reports for indications that there are decreases in the use of extensions in those districts where professional development was conducted. Provide follow-up professional development if guidelines for the appropriate use of extensions are not followed. Phone calls to district pupil appraisal coordinators.

Discussion of Activity 11.6: This activity has been revised and extended to accurately reflect the state’s effort in assisting LEAs with decreasing the number of extensions in the state. Phone calls and emails to special education supervisors are made through the Department’s Point of Contact (POC) model.

Improvement Activities 11.7 Require LEAs with any instances of non-compliance to submit a plan of action in which the LEA reports to the agency the reasons for non-compliance and the action that will be taken to address non-compliance in the following year.

Discussion of Activity 11.7: In order to further reduce the instances of non-compliance, any LEA that is noncompliant will be required to identify the issue that caused the non-compliance and provide measurable activities for ensuring future compliance.

Improvement Activity 11.8 Review a number of initial evaluations. The review will include compliance indicators, as well as the use of best practices. Weakness in the evaluation procedures will also be noted.

Discussion of Activity 11.8 A number of evaluations were reviewed. The Department’s IDEA and NCLB Points of Contact provided support and technical assistance to LEAs on compliance indicators and use of best practices.

Improvement Activity 11.9 LEAs will be offered the opportunity to participate in web-based professional development tutorials. The tutorials will cover a variety of topics relative to evaluation procedures such as child find requirements, evaluation procedures, and other relevant topics. Additionally, information will be shared with the Network teams as supplemental guidance on this topic.

Discussion of Activity 11.9: Rather than rely on web-based tutorials, the IDEA and NCLB Points of Contact will continue to support LEAs and provide opportunities for professional development and technical assistance on a variety of topics relative to evaluation procedures.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 99.7%

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) | 16 |
| 2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | 15 |
| 3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1.) minus (2.)] | 1 |

One of the sixteen LEAs is still in noncompliance as reported in the FFY 2011 APR.

Additional Information required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

| Statement from the Response Table | State’s Response |
|--|--|
| <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of non-compliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of non-compliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with non-compliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> | <p>Identified LEAs have completed plans of action that indicated the reason(s) for the non-compliance of the initial evaluation and what actions will be taken to assure non-compliance will not be repeated.</p> <p>In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly.</p> <p>Correction of noncompliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following fiscal year.</p> <p>After a review of data collected in SER, the State identified one of the sixteen LEAs is still in noncompliance as reported in the FFY 2011 APR. The LEA was required to complete a Plan of Action that detailed the LEAs actions to correct their noncompliance within one calendar year.</p> |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 100% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| | |
|--|------|
| a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A) for Part B eligibility determination) | 1819 |
| b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday | 113 |
| c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays | 1382 |
| d. # for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services | 4 |
| e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 290 |
| # in a but not in b, c, d, or e. | 30 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays</p> <p>Percent = [(c) / (a-b-d-e)] * 100</p> | <p>1382 (c) / 1412 (a-b-d-e) *100 =</p> <p>97.87%</p> |
|---|---|

LEAs are responsible for entering their data in the Special Education Reporting (SER) system. LEAs review their data throughout the year to assure that the data are accurate and reliable. Since SER is a real time interactive database, LEAs are able to verify and make necessary updates during the year. The final data report is run and findings are made at the end of July each year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state did not meet its target for Indicator 12. The children included in (a), but not in (b), (c), (d), or (e) are the children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B, but did not have their IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday. The range of days beyond the third birthday and some of the reasons for the delays are provided below.

Based on data in the Action Plans from the school districts found to be in noncompliance, the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and implemented is 1-90 days. The majority of the delays were 19 days or less. The child for whom the IEP was completed 90 days beyond the third birthday was reported by the LEA as the responsibility of a neighboring district.

Improvement Activity 12.1

- A.** Develop and conduct bi-annual informational meetings with LEA Special Education Supervisors/Directors, LEA Preschool Coordinators, data entry personnel, and Part C personnel. Reprint and distribute Transition Brochure at update meetings and upon request.
- B.** Provide Q and A on transition from Part C to Part B at the bi-annual informational meetings. This Q and A is updated as needed and LEAs are notified via the Department’s newsletter of these updates.
- C.** Review 2 year, 2 month, monthly report from OCDD/Early Steps of potential transition children and distribute to ECSE Regional Coordinators, ECSE Coordinators, and Special Education Supervisors/Directors. Collaborate with LEAs to ensure list is received from OCDD/Early Steps.
- D.** Random monitoring of LEAs to ensure compliance in entering data into SER in timely manner.
- E.** E-mails are sent each quarter by LDOE data staff to Special Education Directors, Preschool Coordinators, and data entry personnel to remind them to run their reports and review their data. TA is available throughout the year upon request.
- F.** Transition booklets were reprinted in English and Spanish, and were provided at both the Fall and Spring update meetings. They are also available upon request.
- G.** Provide sessions on Supporting a Smooth and Effective Transition during the LDOE’s annual Preschool and Kindergarten Conference.

Discussion of Activity 12.1

- A.** This activity was completed in 2009.
- B.** This activity was completed in 2009.
- C.** OCDD continues to send monthly reports of EarlySteps children turning 2 years, 2 months to the LDE, which are then disseminated to the LEAs. This ensures that the LEA is aware of the number of children currently being served in Part C and therefore, potentially eligible for Part B services.
- D.** LEAs are reminded periodically throughout the year to monitor their data, make any correction needed, and submit the required information in a timely manner. The LDOE reviews the data at the end of the fiscal year (July 1), notifies the LEAs of possible noncompliance, and allows the LEAs to make any corrections necessary before the final data report is run on July 31st.

E. This activity has been discontinued. The LDOE is relying on less burdensome, alternate forms of communication with LEAs (network team support, LDOE weekly newsletter, webinars, teleconferences, etc.).

F. Transition booklets were updated and reprinted in English and Spanish and were posted on the LDOE website. Hardcopies are also available upon request.

G. Sessions were conducted relating to preschool special education at the 2012 Preschool and Kindergarten Conference.

Improvement Activity 12.2 A: Conduct reviews and provide technical assistance to ensure data entry for students transitioning is occurring for students from Part C to Part B.

Discussion of Activity 12.2 A:

This activity has been discontinued due to the fact that reviewing LEA data throughout the year would require the LDE to notify the LEA of noncompliance at that point in time. Therefore, LEAs are reminded periodically throughout the year to monitor their data, make any correction needed, and submit the required information in a timely manner. The LDE reviews the data at the end of the fiscal year (July 1) and notifies the LEAs of possible noncompliance and allows the LEAs to make any corrections necessary before the final data report is run on July 31st. Technical assistance is available to the LEAs throughout the year upon request.

Improvement Activity 12.2 D: Disseminate a compliance report and Plan of Action template to LEAs who exhibited noncompliance.

Discussion of Activity 12.2 D:

LEAs that are found to be in noncompliance are notified by the LDE Point of Contact by phone and in writing. Each noncompliant LEA is emailed a Plan of Action which they are to fill out and return to the LDE. Information from the Plan of Actions are used in reporting reasons for delays of IEP implementation.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 98.8%

| | |
|---|----|
| 4. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2012) | 15 |
| 5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | 15 |
| 6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|---|---|
| 7. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above) | 1 |
| 8. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | 1 |
| 9. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)] | 0 |

Actions taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

All noncompliance was corrected.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

Correction of noncompliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% in any given quarter during the following year. The LEA reaches 100% when the data entered into SER reflects that the IEP for each transitioning child is completed and implemented by the third birthday. LDOE staff reviews the data at the end of July each year to determine if there are any LEAs with findings of noncompliance. The LEAs are notified by phone and in writing of the noncompliance. The LEAs

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

are emailed a Plan of Action which identifies each child that did not have an IEP developed and implemented by the third birthday.

On the Plan of Action, in Part One: Demonstrating Compliance by Correcting Individual Cases of Noncompliance, the LEA must state:

- The reason that the IEP was not completed by the 3rd birthday;
- The root cause of the delay (circumstances which may have prevented this IEP from not being implemented in a timely manner);
- The action that occurred with this student; and
- The personnel responsible.

On the Plan of Action, in Part Two: Demonstrating Substantial Compliance, the LEA must:

- State the reason the IEP was not completed by the third birthday;
- What action was taken to ensure IEPs are completed by third birthday;
- Personnel responsible; and
- Evidence to show substantial compliance (evaluation compliance report in SER was run three months in a row to show 100% compliance).

The LDOE works closely with the Special Education Preschool Coordinators in each LEA to ensure regulations are followed.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table

| Statement from the Response Table | State's Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2012, APR that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2010 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and the LEA with the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:</p> | <p>All noncompliance noted in FFY 2011 was corrected within one year of notification during FFY 2012. Uncorrected noncompliance that was noted during FFY 2010 was also corrected during FFY 2012.</p> |
| <p>(1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and</p> | <p>Based upon a review of 2012-2013 data from our special education data system, LDOE has verified that all LEAs have achieved 100% compliance during FFY 2012, thus correcting FFY 2011 noncompliance. LDOE has further verified that IEPs have been developed and implemented for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.</p> |
| <p>(2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> | <p>Verification was obtained by electronically matching birth date, IEP development date, and IEP start date (implementation date). This match is done in the special education data system. If the three dates do not properly align, the student record is flagged.</p> |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service’s needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service’s needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 100% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| FFY | Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP | Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements | Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements |
|------|---|---|--|
| 2012 | 220 | 220 | 100.00% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state met its target for Indicator 13.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 76%

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) | 4 |
| 2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) | 4 |
| 3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|---|----------|
| 4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above) | 0 |
| 5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | 0 |
| 6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

During FFY 2011, four districts were cited for noncompliance in the area of secondary transition. The state notified districts of noncompliance through a *Summary of Findings* report. Districts cited for noncompliance were to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to address the ways in which they would improve their areas of noncompliance. Within one year all districts cited in FFY 2011 had corrected all issues of noncompliance as evidenced through CAP activity documentation submitted to the LDOE. To ensure that each district had no evidence of ongoing noncompliance, follow up data was collected through the desk audit process and by using the SER database during FFY 2012. No further evidence of noncompliance was found.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)]

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|---|
| 2012 | A= 25.9% enrolled in higher education B= 55.9% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed C= 74.2% enrolled in higher education or in some postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment |

| FFY | Actual Target Data |
|------|---|
| 2012 | A= 28.7% enrolled in higher education B= 74.44% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed C= 88.19% enrolled in higher education or in some postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment |

The state continues to use a census for this indicator and districts collect post school data by phone survey or through mail surveys. Districts submit their results to the Department through SER. Survey results indicate that there were 6,805 students who exited during the 2011-2012 school year. Louisiana calculated the results by dividing the number of respondents in each category by the total number of respondents in the post school survey and multiplying each by 100 per the requirements of Indicator 14. Additionally, 3,302 former students responded to the post school follow up survey giving Louisiana a 49% response rate. Results indicate that (1) 949 respondents were enrolled in higher education, (2) 1,509 respondents were competitively employed, (3) 289 respondents were in some other postsecondary education or training, and (4) 165 respondents were in some other type of employment. Using the required calculation our results are as follows: A=949÷3302 x 100 =28.7%; B=1509÷ 3302 x 100 = 74.44 %; and C= 289 ÷3302=88.19%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state met its targets for Indicator 14.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

[20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B)]

Measurement:
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:
 a. # of findings of noncompliance.
 b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
 Percent = (b. divided by a.) times 100.
States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment 1).

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------|--------------------------------|
| FFY 2012 | 100% |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. | | | | |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|
| <p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training program, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> | <p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.</p> | <p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.</p> | <p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.</p> | <p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> | <p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements.</p> | <p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit,</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | | |
|---|--|----|----|----|
| 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement. | On-Site Visits, or Other | | | |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 15 | 15 | 15 |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other areas of noncompliance: | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Other areas of noncompliance: | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 7 | 7 | 7 |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------|---------------|
| Other areas of noncompliance: | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sum the numbers down Column (a) and Column (b) | | | 51 | 50 |
| Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = | | | (b) / (a) X 100 | 98.04% |
| [Column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum] times 100. | | | = | |

Describe the process for selecting LEAs for Monitoring:

Each LEA in the state is monitored by various measures to ensure that it is in compliance with federal and state laws while serving students with disabilities. Each LEA receives a determination score which is based on several factors including Math and ELA performance, disproportionality, and graduation rate. Additionally, through selected APR indicators, each district is monitored, and those whose scores are outside the standard are required to analyze and address the cause for discrepancy. When appropriate, the LEAs must report their findings and corrections. For 2013-2014, a new IDEA Monitoring selection process was implemented. LEAs were assigned a total risk score based on the LEA determination risk factors. Risk scores were averaged and LEAs ranked by risk. The top 20% were selected for IDEA Monitoring compliance desk reviews.

Timely Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) [Sum of Column (a) on the Indicator B15 Worksheet] | 51 |
| 2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) [Sum of Column (b) on the Indicator B15 Worksheet] | 50 |
| 3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year (1. minus 2.) | 1 |

FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from 3. above) | 1 |
| 5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) | 0 |
| 6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected (4. minus 5.) | 0 |

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (either timely or subsequent): The LEAs submitted completed Plans of Action which addressed areas of noncompliance. The plans were reviewed and tracked by LDOE staff. The state has verified correction of the FFY 2011 findings by conducting follow-up monitoring which revealed one instance of continuing non-compliance.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken):

Identification and Correction of Noncompliance

LEAs found to be noncompliant receive written notification from the LDOE and are required to submit a Plan of Action. An LEA must outline the steps it will take to correct noncompliance, establish a timeline for correction, identify personnel responsible, and submit verification for correcting compliance issues. The LEA is encouraged to collaborate with the Department’s IDEA Monitoring Section during the development of their plan and must submit the plan within thirty-five business days of receipt of the Summary of Findings Report. Upon receipt of the findings, the LEA must immediately begin correcting noncompliance. The LEA demonstrates the implementation of the plan by submitting required documentation to the LDOE according to the timelines established in the approved Plan of Action. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after receipt of the Summary of Findings Report.

If it is determined that further corrective action is needed, an Intensive Corrective Action Plan (ICAP) with accelerated timelines is required, and the local school board or designated appointing authority is notified. For those LEAs who experience difficulty achieving compliance after state technical assistance and training, the LDOE has required that IDEA funds be used to employ state-approved special consultants.

When critical issues of noncompliance are identified by means other than onsite visits or data analysis, targeted onsite compliance monitoring may be conducted. Proactive measures of self-evaluation, support, and technical assistance are available as part of the monitoring process to ensure compliance with federal and state regulatory requirements.

Follow-Up Monitoring

Follow-up monitoring is conducted for all LEAs where previous areas of noncompliance were identified. The course of action for follow-up monitoring includes reviewing a reasonable selection of the noncompliant files to ensure that individual cases have been corrected. Additional records are reviewed to ensure that the LEA has systematically implemented all specific regulatory requirements related to the previously identified noncompliance. LEAs are notified in writing of the results of the follow-up monitoring visit.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

The IDEA Point of Contact for the one LEA that remains noncompliant for FFY 2011 has developed a plan to offer intensive support and technical assistance to the LEA. The POC and the monitoring staff will follow up to ensure that the LEA systematically implements all regulatory requirements.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

If the State reported <100% for this indicator in its FFY 2010 APR and did not report in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining FFY 2010 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP’s FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator | 2 |
| 2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected | 2 |
| 3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected (1. minus 2.) | 0 |

A 2012 desk review revealed no continuing noncompliance.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, 2007, and 2006

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP’s FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator | 5 |
| 2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected | 5 |
| 3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected (1. minus 2.) | 0 |

The LEA identified in 2009 as having continued non-compliance participated in a desk review monitoring in 2012 and was found to be in compliance. The LEA hired a consultant to provide targeted training to staff specifically in the area of disciplinary procedures. They also hired a new special education director in the summer of 2012. With this district support and support from the LDOE, the LEA fulfilled their ICAP and was able to provide records for review which demonstrated no evidence of non-compliance.

The findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2007 and FFY 2006 APRs have been corrected. Follow-up monitoring with this LEA in April 2013 resulted in no findings of non-compliance. The special education team, along with the LEA superintendent and an outside consultant, have worked together to train staff and put in place procedural safeguards. These safeguards have provided better methods of handling behavioral issues, including measures which identify students at risk for disciplinary action, and provide intensive support early. The LEA has been released from its ICAP and its requirements for consultative services.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012:

For FFY 2012 Louisiana did not meet the Indicator 15 target of 100% correction of noncompliance within one year.

Improvement Activity 15.2:

LDOE revised *Bulletin 1922*, which outlines Louisiana’s general supervision procedures, to include appropriate guidelines for applying sanctions for noncompliance by LEAs. LDOE also:

- Evaluated the effectiveness of the sanction process by comparing SPP baseline data from the Dec. 2, 2005 submission with data collected under new procedures.
- Investigated LEA noncompliance that exceeds one-year timelines to determine causes.
- Included all monitoring activities (desk-audits, on-site monitoring, data review, etc.).
- Revised Bulletin 1922 to delete reference to LEA self-review data submission to LDOE until NCLB and IDEA monitoring process is combined. At that time, self-reviews will be required of all LEAs selected for onsite monitoring visits.
- Plans to develop a monitoring manual to address the new desk top monitoring process.

Discussion of Activity 15.2: For the 2012-2013 school year, the LDOE IDEA Monitoring section staff, in conjunction with staff in the divisions of NCLB and IDEA Support and Monitoring, developed new procedures for IDEA compliance monitoring. The changes, which were minimal for the LEAs being monitored, were announced to LEAs via the monthly newsletter from the State Superintendent and via e-mail and postal mail. LEAs which were selected for monitoring were notified via mail and e-mail and were invited to participate in an individual entrance call to discuss the new monitoring process. The monitoring forms utilized for reviews were provided to the LEAs in advance of monitoring and are available to all LEAs upon request. A monitoring manual for the new desk review monitoring process is being considered further. The new IDEA monitoring process is part of the LDOE’s consolidated monitoring responsibility, which includes several federal programs, as an effort to consolidate monitoring into one visit for the LEA rather than several by various offices throughout the school year.

Improvement Activity 15.6:

LDOE developed five network teams comprised of network specialists to assist LEAs and individual schools in their assigned network by providing special education related information, trainings, and technical assistance.

Discussion of Activity 15.6: The Department’s five Network teams worked directly with districts to set goals for the classroom, observe classroom practices, and provide support for all students, including students with disabilities.

Additional Information required by the OSEP FFY 2011 APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

| Statement from the Response Table | State’s Response |
|---|--|
| The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2012 APR, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, the two remaining findings in FFY 2007, and the one remaining finding in FFY 2006, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2011 APR, were corrected. | The two findings of noncompliance remaining from FFY 2009, and the findings from FFY 2006 and 2007 have been corrected. |
| When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with | Follow-up monitoring of the LEA identified in 2009 as having findings of noncompliance continuing through FFY 2011 has revealed 100% compliance. |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and FFY 2009, FFY 2007 and FFY 2006: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> | <p>Individual cases of noncompliance were corrected and verified through the CAP and ICAP reports, as well as in follow-up reviews.</p> <p>FFY 2006 and FFY 2008 noncompliance has been resolved, and the LEA received a report of no noncompliance after a follow-up review.</p> |
| <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2012 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> | <p>IDEA monitoring protocols have been reviewed and reorganized. The state had directed significant effort to making improvements and supporting LEAs so that 100% compliance can be achieved.</p> |
| <p>The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2012 APR that it has corrected the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2006. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2012 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2012 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of the remaining finding of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2011 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> | <p>All findings of non-compliance have been corrected.</p> |
| <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> | <p>See Indicators 11, 12, and 13.</p> |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:
The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|---|
| 2012 | The State is not required to report a target except in any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions are held. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

The percent of resolutions meetings held that resulted in resolution meeting settlement agreements was 62.5%.

$(5/8 = 0.625) \text{ -- } 0.625 \times 100 = 62.5\%$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The State is not required to report on improvement activities or progress or slippage except in any fiscal year in which ten or more resolutions sessions are held.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:
 Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--|
| 2012 | The State is not required to report a target except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations are held. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements was 50%.

$[(2+0)/4 = 0.50] \text{ -- } 0.50 \times 100 = 50\%$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The State is not required to report on improvement activities or progress or slippage except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations are held.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports).
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

As stated in the Indicator Measurement Table, States may, but are not required, to report data for this indicator. OSEP will use the Indicator 20 Rubric to calculate the State’s data for this indicator. States will have an opportunity to review and respond to OSEP’s calculation of the State’s data.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2012 | 100% |

Actual Target Data for 2012:

The State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate at 100%. The state met its target of 100% for this indicator.

LDOE has elected to use the OSEP Scoring Rubric to determine timeliness and accuracy of FFY 2012 data.

LDOE has elected to allow OSEP to complete the 618 data table as per the directions in the December OSEP TA call.

| Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| APR Indicator | Valid and reliable | Correct calculation | Total |
| 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | | 1 |
| 3A | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3B | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3C | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4A | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4B | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

APR Template – Part B (4)

Louisiana

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------|
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 19 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | Subtotal | 38 |
| APR Score Calculation | Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2012 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | | 5 |
| | Grand Total – (Sum of the subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | | 43.00 |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

The state met its target for Indicator 20.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:

The State is not seeking to revise targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time.