

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part B**

for  
**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**Louisiana**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

193

#### General Supervision System

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

#### MONITORING

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

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

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

#### DISPUTE RESOLUTION

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

#### IEP FACILITATION

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school systems. Typically, an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Facilitator is brought in when parents and school system staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school system can request IEP facilitation; however, since the process is voluntary, both sides must agree to participate. The process can be initiated by request to the Legal Division of the State Department of Education, and the service is provided at no cost to the parent or the school system.

#### INFORMAL COMPLAINTS / EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS

Parents of children with disabilities may file informal complaints. The implementation of the informal complaint/Early Resolution Process (ERP) draws on the traditional model of parents and school systems working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.

#### FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

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

#### MEDIATION

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school systems regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school systems may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.

Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school systems with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation is a voluntary process, and all parties must agree to participate in order for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location that is convenient to the parties in the dispute. Mediation services are provided by LDOE at no cost to parents and school systems.

A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The discussions in a mediation session are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent due process hearings or civil court proceedings. If the mediation process results in full or partial agreement, the mediator will prepare a written mediation agreement that must be signed by both parties. In addition to describing agreements made in the course of mediation, the mediation agreement will state that all discussions that occurred during the mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in a due process hearing or civil court proceeding. The signed agreement shall be legally binding on both parties and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.

#### DUE PROCESS HEARING

A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an administrative law judge (ALJ) to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school system regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability. Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school system may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability within one year of the date that the alleged action forming the basis of the hearing request was known or should have been known. This one-year limit does not apply if the parents were prevented from requesting the hearing because the school system specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school system withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

Once a request for a hearing is received, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an ALJ to the case, and he or she will be provided with a copy of the hearing request. Otherwise, the request remains confidential. The ALJ will then coordinate a prehearing conference to discuss the hearing process and establish a schedule for activities related to the hearing. Please see Introduction attachment for additional information.

#### Technical Assistance System

##### **The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

LDOE employs two primary mechanisms to provide technical assistance that ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs: field support and planning resources.

#### FIELD SUPPORT

##### Network Structure

The network structure is the primary support vehicle for school systems, providing immediate, targeted assistance to all of Louisiana's LEAs. Louisiana's parishes are divided into two networks plus a charter school network. Networks are organized by geography, size and existing relationships. Each network has a network support team that includes a Point of Contact. These leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their school systems and build upon those strengths to support implementation of instructional reforms. They are also the LEA's primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic questions—including IDEA-related questions. They also review and approve applications and prepare school systems for audits and monitoring. Network leaders and teams facilitate regular meetings with school systems to discuss what is working in classrooms statewide and what processes need further refinement. Network staff works side by side with school system and school level administrators to regularly observe practices at the school level, fostering alignment on quality instructional practices and effective feedback. Their work includes analyzing student and teacher data on which to base feedback and recommendations; providing technical assistance in determining the best evaluation systems and curriculum; and assisting school systems in the transition to new evaluation and assessment systems.

##### Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 6,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a three-day conference that kicks off instructional planning for the following school year; and 2) School Support Institutes - a training sequence during the school year to support school leadership teams in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. LDOE also expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.

#### PLANNING RESOURCES

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

- 1) School System Planning Framework - serves as the primary planning tool for school systems. The Framework includes the key priorities LDOE has established in partnership with school systems, and school systems should use this Framework to identify their own priorities for student improvement.
- 2) Super App - is a new online application that communicates school system priorities for the next school year and consolidates the process for approval of formula and competitive funds.
- 3) School System Planning Guide - provides crucial guidance on how a school system will build a plan and submit a Super App for formula and competitive funds to support that plan. This includes the additional resources needed to build a plan that aligns to priorities highlighted in the Framework.
- 4) Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities - provides principals and school system leaders with resources to create strong support plans. It is organized around four proven strategies for improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities: 1) identify disabilities early and accurately, 2) provide high-quality instruction to ensure the achievement of ambitious IEP goals, 3) strengthen instruction with specialized supports and related services, and 4) coordinate effective transition planning and implementation.
- 5) School System Planning Calls - scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the School System Planning Guide with school system planning teams. These calls provide continuous, ongoing support to LEA superintendents, as well as senior staff in technology, assessment and curriculum, and special education. During these calls, LDOE provides more in-depth support, fields questions in real time, and integrates high-priority policies and other topics. In FFY 2018, LDOE regularly integrated support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on the alternate assessment, Louisiana's Connector standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, high cost services, alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and other priorities.

More information on LDOE's School System Support Structure can be found on LDOE's website:

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/school-system-support-toolbox>

### **Professional Development System**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.**

#### EDUCATOR-FOCUSED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

##### LOUISIANA TEACHER LEADERS

LDOE believes that those closest to students, educators and parents, are best positioned to support students and thus the implementation of the standards. Given this belief, LDOE invests in the Teacher Leaders initiative to provide educators with resources and training so that they can make local, empowered decisions to support their unique students.

The Louisiana Teacher Leaders make up a group of over 6,000 outstanding educators from around the state who are focused on high expectations for students. This group was born out of three core beliefs: 1) those closest to students are best positioned to make instructional decisions, 2) the State has a role in providing resources and training directly to teachers, and 3) Teacher Leaders are a powerful voice in training fellow teachers.

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

Teacher Support Toolbox provides educators with direct links to the tools and resources to continue raising the bar for students in Louisiana.

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/teacher-support-toolbox>

##### Teacher Leader Library

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/louisiana-teacher-leaders>

School System Support Calendar, a supplement to the School System Planning Guide, provides the schedule of in-person trainings, virtual support, tools and resources, and communication streams designed to support educators as they establish high expectations for teaching and learning to ensure that every student succeeds.

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/teacher-toolbox-resources/school-system-support-calendar.pdf?sfvrsn=112>

##### Teacher Leader Newsletter

[https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfOZaLZLI80PZiGpayxJVpa7EAW7gDW1x9C6POnF\\_--toChZA/viewform](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfOZaLZLI80PZiGpayxJVpa7EAW7gDW1x9C6POnF_--toChZA/viewform)

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

##### CONTENT LEADER

Content Leaders are local educators who have the knowledge, skills, and concrete resources to provide high-quality, content-rich, and curriculum specific professional development to new and current teachers in their school system. The Content Leader program builds on the success of the Teacher Leader project and has two main goals: 1) equip a cadre of talented educators with the knowledge and skills to coach and support other teachers within their schools and school systems, and 2) grow local leadership pipelines for schools and school systems by developing talented teachers within the system. The Content Leader role is also an important step in the leadership pipeline for talented local educators.

[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/content-leader-training-application-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=eb7f9a1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/content-leader-training-application-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=eb7f9a1f_4)

##### INTERVENTION CONTENT LEADER

Expanding on Louisiana's Content Leader initiative, Intervention Content Leaders are educators with expertise in providing effective intervention for struggling students. The Intervention Content Leader program builds an understanding of how to best support struggling students through high-quality intervention that provides access to standards-aligned curriculum. The role of the Intervention Content Leader is to: 1) train teachers to use core instruction and intervention time ensuring all students can access a high quality curriculum, and 2) support school leadership to ensure all teachers in the school use effective intervention strategies.

[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/intervention-content-leader-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=4c1f911f\\_6](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/intervention-content-leader-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=4c1f911f_6)

##### SCHOOL SUPPORT INSTITUTES

School leadership teams play an important role in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. The School Support Institutes support school leadership to play this role. Each school system and school are assigned to a cohort geographically, and participants are asked to attend all three sessions of their assigned cohort. Participants can choose one of three pathways for the entire training sequence. School teams can choose different pathways for team members to attend or select one pathway to attend together.

[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/school-redesign/2019-summit-school-support-institutes.pdf?sfvrsn=d1889c1f\\_6](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/school-redesign/2019-summit-school-support-institutes.pdf?sfvrsn=d1889c1f_6)

##### PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUCCESS GUIDE

LDOE believes all students should spend the majority of their time reading, speaking, writing, and solving curriculum-based tasks. To be successful, students with disabilities often require additional support. They need educators equipped to deliver specialized supports to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities, and direct services from certified providers to accomplish specific goals outlined in a student's individualized education program.

The Partnerships for Success Guide provides school systems with a list of partners that can provide professional development to develop the capacity of educators to deliver specialized supports and organizations that can fulfill the direct service needs often required to support students with disabilities. When

equipped with knowledge and strategies to deliver specialized support and direct services, school systems can more adequately address the unique

needs of students with disabilities and ensure meaningful engagement in the classroom every day.

[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/partnerships-for-success-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=3af99d1f\\_2](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/partnerships-for-success-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=3af99d1f_2)

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

#### **The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana's values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018. The FFY 2013 SPP/APR describes the three phases: 1) internal review and vetting process, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration in depth.

Since the target setting process was completed during FFY 2013, LDOE has revisited targets to determine if revisions were needed. For the FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission on February 1, 2019, LDOE revised its target for Indicator 8 and sought feedback from educators, parents, and other stakeholders, including the SEAP. For the FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, states must extend their indicator targets to include FFY 2019 due to the SPP/APR cycle being extended by one year. LDOE addressed this directive and sought stakeholder feedback on FFY 2019 indicator target setting from the SEAP. Based on this feedback and reviewing the State's historical data, LDOE will extend the progressive growth pattern (target increase of 2% from year to year) for Indicator 1, and keep fixed targets (same target as FFY 2018) for Indicators 2-16.

LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

NO

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

LDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each school system on the targets in the SPP/APR in the Special Education Reporting and Funding library on the State's website. This information is labeled Performance Profiles and is located under the Performance Profiles section. The Special Education Reporting and Funding library also publicly reports the State's SPP, including any revisions. This information is labeled LA SPP/APR and is located under the State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report section. To access this information, please use the following web link and locate the sections titled Performance Profiles and State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, respectively.

<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support visit to the State on November 13-15, 2019 and is currently developing a response that will be issued under separate cover.

### **Intro - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the

State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Intro - State Attachments

The attachment(s) included are in compliance with Section 508. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.



Louisiana FFY 2018  
Introduction Disput



Clarification  
Response Table FFY

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

#### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2011	29.30%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%
Data	36.70%	42.80%	44.30%	46.64%	52.50%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	48.00%	50.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,412
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,068
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.29%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,412	4,068	52.50%	48.00%	59.29%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

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

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

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.**

Students in Louisiana can pursue two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, either the TOPS University pathway or a TOPS Tech Jump Start Career diploma. Both options are available to students with IEPs. However, Act 833 (2014) gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue an alternative pathway to a regular high school diploma. The law can be implemented in compliance with federal and state law, provided that students remain able to access the traditional diploma and curriculum requirements, even as they use alternate means of demonstrating proficiency. Graduation requirements for Act 833 eligible students include the following:

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

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

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**1 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>37.00%</b>
-----------------	-------------	---------------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	35.00%	34.00%	33.00%	30.00%	27.00%
Data	33.96%	27.61%	28.03%	28.54%	24.31%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	25.00%	25.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

### Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,584

Source	Date	Description	Data
FS009; Data Group 85)			
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	300
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	38
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	765
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	30

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
765	3,717	24.31%	25.00%	20.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

#### Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 2 - Required Actions

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate 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.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
A	Overall	99.19%	Actual	99.04%	97.60%	98.52%	99.31%	95.52%

### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
A	Overall	99.16%	Actual	98.96%	97.47%	98.46%	99.24%	95.50%

### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.80%	98.80%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	45,915	45,034	95.52%	98.80%	98.08%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	46,051	45,127	95.50%	98.80%	97.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Louisiana reports comprehensively on students with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and school system.  
<https://www.louisianaschools.com>

Louisiana's Spring 2019 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, school system, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.  
[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2019-school-leap-2025-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=5da19c1f\\_8](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2019-school-leap-2025-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=5da19c1f_8)

Louisiana's Special Education Data Profile (2017-2018) consist of statewide assessment tables, including: 1) students with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and alternate (LEAP Connect/LAA 1) assessments, 2) students with disabilities who scored basic/good and above on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) students with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LEAP Connect/LAA 1 assessment.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2017-18-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=c4149f1f\\_8](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2017-18-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=c4149f1f_8)

LDOE's "Measuring Results" and "Data Center" web links report on K-12 assessments, early childhood centers, and school and student results, including School and Center Report Cards, School and Center Performance Scores, and Closing the Equity Gap.  
 Measuring Results homepage: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment>  
 Data Center: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center>

LDOE's Academic Center for Students with Disabilities  
<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

LDOE's Special Education Reporting and Funding, including Performance Profiles  
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2015 to 2017" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2014 to FFY 2016.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=85e99d1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=85e99d1f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2018" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2017.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=84e99d1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=84e99d1f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2019" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2018.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2019.xlsx?sfvrsn=e4619a1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2019.xlsx?sfvrsn=e4619a1f_4)

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

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level 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)]. Calculate 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.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	37.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	41.00%
A	Overall	33.50%	Actual	36.98%	36.64%	38.21%	38.70%	34.03%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	37.70%	37.70%	38.70%	39.70%	40.70%
A	Overall	36.50%	Actual	40.32%	33.96%	36.06%	35.77%	33.25%

#### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	43.00%	43.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	41.70%	41.70%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
-------	------------	--	---	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------	----------

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	45,034	17,757	34.03%	43.00%	39.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	45,127	15,948	33.25%	41.70%	35.34%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Louisiana reports comprehensively on students with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and school system.  
<https://www.louisianaschools.com>

Louisiana's Spring 2019 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, school system, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.  
[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2019-school-leap-2025-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=5da19c1f\\_8](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2019-school-leap-2025-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=5da19c1f_8)

Louisiana's Special Education Data Profile (2017-2018) consist of statewide assessment tables, including: 1) students with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and alternate (LEAP Connect/LAA 1) assessments, 2) students with disabilities who scored basic/good and above on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) students with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LEAP Connect/LAA 1 assessment.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2017-18-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=c4149f1f\\_8](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2017-18-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=c4149f1f_8)

LDOE's "Measuring Results" and "Data Center" web links report on K-12 assessments, early childhood centers, and school and student results, including School and Center Report Cards, School and Center Performance Scores, and Closing the Equity Gap.  
 Measuring Results homepage: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment>  
 Data Center: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center>

LDOE's Academic Center for Students with Disabilities  
<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

LDOE's Special Education Reporting and Funding, including Performance Profiles  
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2015 to 2017" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2014 to FFY 2016.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=85e99d1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=85e99d1f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2018" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2017.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=84e99d1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=84e99d1f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternate Test Summary 2019" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternate assessments for FFY 2018.  
[https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2019.xlsx?sfvrsn=e4619a1f\\_4](https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2019.xlsx?sfvrsn=e4619a1f_4)

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

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	26.50%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	23.50%	21.50%	19.50%	17.50%	15.50%
Data	31.54%	16.86%	14.91%	19.02%	18.50%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	13.50%	13.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**



Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
36	182	18.50%	13.50%	19.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The majority of LEAs discrepant were charter schools. Charter schools in Louisiana typically have a small special education population, thus increasing the chances of being found discrepant, even if only one student is removed for greater than 10 days.

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

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

Louisiana has defined significant discrepancy as the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Since the State uses percentages, there is no minimum n-size. Thus, all LEAs were included in the calculation. For the FFY 2018 APR submission, the state average was 0.96%. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 1.44% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

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

The FFY 2018 APR generally reflects data from school year 2018-2019. However indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2017-2018.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)**

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

For each of the LEAs the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, LDOE completed the following process:

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:
  - a. the LEA's code of conduct;
  - b. the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
  - c. the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
  - d. the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
  - e. the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
  - f. the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated noncompliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:
  - a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
  - b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2017 APR, due February 1, 2019.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups 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 of 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have 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) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

### 4B - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2009	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.13%	1.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

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

14

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19	0	168	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

Louisiana defined significant discrepancy for a particular race/ethnicity as the percent of all students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days at a rate 1.5 times greater than the state average not to exceed 3%. Additionally, in order to be significantly discrepant, there had to be more than one student in the race/ethnic group. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was 0.96%. Thus, any race/ethnic group whose percentage was greater than 1.44% and who had more than one student represented in the race/ethnic group was considered significantly discrepant.

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

The FFY 2018 APR generally reflects data from school year 2018 – 2019. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2017 – 2018.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)**

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

For each of the LEAs the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, LDOE completed the following process:

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:
  - a. the LEA's code of conduct;
  - b. the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
  - c. the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
  - d. the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
  - e. the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
  - f. the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated noncompliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:

- a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
  - b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2017 APR, due February 1, 2019.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

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

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	61.50%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%
A	57.60%	Data	62.37%	61.34%	59.67%	60.72%	60.87%
B	2005	Target <=	13.74%	13.70%	13.65%	13.60%	13.56%
B	16.70%	Data	13.90%	14.31%	13.91%	14.71%	14.66%
C	2005	Target <=	1.31%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%
C	1.90%	Data	1.36%	1.30%	1.33%	1.25%	1.24%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	64.00%	64.00%
Target B <=	13.50%	13.50%
Target C <=	1.30%	1.30%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	76,345
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	47,149

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,138
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	278
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	83
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	552

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	47,149	76,345	60.87%	64.00%	61.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,138	76,345	14.66%	13.50%	14.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	913	76,345	1.24%	1.30%	1.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

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.

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.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

### 6 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	27.00%	30.00%
A	21.20%	Data	22.66%	24.29%	23.92%	21.25%	20.27%
B	2011	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.90%
B	3.70%	Data	3.79%	3.54%	3.61%	3.86%	5.06%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	31.00%	31.00%
Target B <=	2.90%	2.90%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	10,484
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,947



Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	521
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	17
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,947	10,484	20.27%	31.00%	18.57%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	539	10,484	5.06%	2.90%	5.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	In FFY 18 there was a 7% increase in the number of 3 year olds identified with disabilities, although the number of early childcare seats for 3 year olds in Louisiana did not increase at the same rate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### 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 = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered 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 = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # 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 = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2010	Target >=	63.50%	71.00%	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	69.60%	Data	71.53%	71.54%	72.59%	72.90%	71.37%
A2	2010	Target >=	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%
A2	64.90%	Data	64.97%	62.94%	64.05%	63.74%	61.44%
B1	2010	Target >=	63.50%	72.00%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%
B1	70.90%	Data	72.06%	72.22%	72.72%	73.14%	71.08%
B2	2010	Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.50%	59.00%
B2	56.20%	Data	58.45%	57.39%	57.77%	56.37%	55.00%
C1	2010	Target >=	71.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%
C1	74.70%	Data	75.76%	75.96%	75.11%	75.96%	74.69%
C2	2010	Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%
C2	69.00%	Data	69.77%	68.49%	68.31%	67.30%	65.93%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	72.50%	72.50%
Target A2 >=	66.50%	66.50%
Target B1 >=	73.50%	73.50%
Target B2 >=	59.50%	59.50%
Target C1 >=	76.50%	76.50%
Target C2 >=	71.50%	71.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,261

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	411	9.90%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	646	15.57%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	993	23.93%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,308	31.52%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	792	19.08%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6	2,301	3,358	71.37%	72.50%	68.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,100	4,150	61.44%	66.50%	50.60%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	421	10.14%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	520	12.53%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	916	22.07%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,573	37.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	720	17.35%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,489	3,430	71.08%	73.50%	72.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,293	4,150	55.00%	59.50%	55.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	490	11.81%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	937	22.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	868	20.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,193	28.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	662	15.95%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the	2,061	3,488	74.69%	76.50%	59.09%	Did Not Meet	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.						Target	
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	1,855	4,150	65.93%	71.50%	44.70%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Historically, LDOE utilized the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) as the tool to measure child outcomes reported to OSEP, while early childcare centers and preschool programs utilized GOLD (by Teaching Strategies). As a result of the separate assessments, special education and general education teachers were not able to collaborate around a common set of data.</p> <p>Beginning in FFY 18, programs transitioned to using GOLD (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement for AEPS. The shift allowed LEAs to streamline the assessment process by coordinating efforts with these programs. Additionally, it allowed the inclusion of children receiving speech and language support to be represented in the outcomes data. While this shift will positively impact children with disabilities, it will take time to ensure that all teachers receive the appropriate training and support, as well as begin to utilize the tools with a more collaborative approach.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies GOLD has made several changes to the assessment platform including providing a drop down option to select different entry and exit assessment tools. This option allowed LEAs to use an AEPS entry assessment in conjunction with a TS GOLD exit assessment. Now that the transition is complete, the ability to choose multiple assessment options will be removed and both entry and exit assessments will be conducted through TS GOLD.</p>
A2	<p>Historically, LDOE utilized the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) as the tool to measure child outcomes reported to OSEP, while early childcare centers and preschool programs utilized GOLD (by Teaching Strategies). As a result of the separate assessments, special education and general education teachers were not able to collaborate around a common set of data.</p> <p>Beginning in FFY 18, programs transitioned to using GOLD (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement for AEPS. The shift allowed LEAs to streamline the assessment process by coordinating efforts with these programs. Additionally, it allowed the inclusion of children receiving speech and language support to be represented in the outcomes data. While this shift will positively impact children with disabilities, it will take time to ensure that all teachers receive the appropriate training and support, as well as begin to utilize the tools with a more collaborative approach.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies GOLD has made several changes to the assessment platform including providing a drop down option to select different entry and exit assessment tools. This option allowed LEAs to use an AEPS entry assessment in conjunction with a TS GOLD exit assessment. Now that the transition is complete, the ability to choose multiple assessment options will be removed and both entry and exit assessments will be conducted through TS GOLD.</p>
C1	<p>Historically, LDOE utilized the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) as the tool to measure child outcomes reported to OSEP, while early childcare centers and preschool programs utilized GOLD (by Teaching Strategies). As a result of the separate assessments, special education and general education teachers were not able to collaborate around a common set of data.</p> <p>Beginning in FFY 18, programs transitioned to using GOLD (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement for AEPS. The shift allowed LEAs to streamline the assessment process by coordinating efforts with these programs. Additionally, it allowed the inclusion of children receiving speech and language support to be represented in the outcomes data. While this shift will positively impact children with disabilities, it will take time to ensure that all teachers receive the appropriate training and support, as well as begin to utilize the tools with a more collaborative approach.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies GOLD has made several changes to the assessment platform including providing a drop down option to select different entry and exit assessment tools. This option allowed LEAs to use an AEPS entry assessment in conjunction with a TS GOLD exit assessment. Now that the transition is complete, the ability to choose multiple assessment options will be removed and both entry and exit assessments will be conducted through TS GOLD.</p>
C2	<p>Historically, LDOE utilized the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) as the tool to measure child outcomes reported to OSEP, while early childcare centers and preschool programs utilized GOLD (by Teaching Strategies). As a result of the separate assessments, special education and general education teachers were not able to collaborate around a common set of data.</p> <p>Beginning in FFY 18, programs transitioned to using GOLD (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement for AEPS. The shift allowed LEAs to streamline the assessment process by coordinating efforts with these programs. Additionally, it allowed the inclusion of children receiving speech and language support to be represented in the outcomes data. While this shift will positively impact children with disabilities, it will take time to ensure that all teachers receive the appropriate training and support, as well as begin to utilize the tools with a more collaborative approach.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies GOLD has made several changes to the assessment platform including providing a drop down option to select different entry and exit assessment tools. This option allowed LEAs to use an AEPS entry assessment in conjunction with a TS GOLD exit</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	assessment. Now that the transition is complete, the ability to choose multiple assessment options will be removed and both entry and exit assessments will be conducted through TS GOLD.

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

Ratings are made on the tools standard objectives and the system pulls outcome data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each category. Teaching Strategies GOLD uses their online system to automatically produce OSEP progress categories and crosswalk the data with the Global Child Outcomes 1-3 which can be found on ECTA’s website (<https://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/Crosswalk-TS%20GOLD.pdf>).

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

Ratings are made on the tools standard objectives and the system pulls outcome data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each category. Teaching Strategies GOLD uses their online system to automatically produce OSEP progress categories and crosswalk the data with the Global Child Outcomes 1-3 which can be found on ECTA’s website (<https://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/Crosswalk-TS%20GOLD.pdf>).

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

In FFY 2018 the State transitioned to TS GOLD to collect and report data for this indicator.

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### 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.

#### Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

### 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

#### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	39.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	81.50%	82.50%
Data	33.45%	42.60%	77.63%	85.38%	83.25%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	83.50%	83.50%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
228	266	83.25%	83.50%	85.71%	Met Target	No Slippage

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

11,684

**Percentage of respondent parents**

2.28%

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

LDOE uses a single parent involvement survey. LEAs disseminate the survey to parents of all children with disabilities, including preschool children. LDOE's FFY 2018 data reflect both preschool and school age respondents. LDOE compares the response rate of parents of preschool children with the statewide percentage of preschool children with disabilities to ensure responses are valid and reliable. In FFY 2018, approximately 11.7% of survey respondents were parents of preschool students with disabilities, which is reflective of the statewide rate of 12.1%, ensuring valid and reliable results.

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

Louisiana serves over 70,000 students with disabilities, ages 3-21, in LEAs ranging in size from single school charter schools to districts with over 40,000 students. To reach this diverse range of school systems, schools, and students, LDOE developed a statistically valid sampling plan for the SPP/APR cycle. Louisiana used a two-step process to develop the sampling plan that was approved by OSEP in January 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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

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

LDOE took additional steps to structure the data collection tool to ensure response data are valid and reliable. The FFY 2018 parent survey included basic demographic information of children receiving special education services, ten required questions on parent's experience with his/her child's school, and two additional optional open ended questions. Parents had to complete required sections of the survey in order for responses to be included in the final report. LDOE monitored response rates monthly and contacted LEAs to ensure surveys were distributed and parents were encouraged to complete the survey. LDOE coordinated with parent centers to assist parents with completing the survey, made interpreters available for parents with limited English skills, and made the survey available online in Spanish, Vietnamese, and Arabic. LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to statewide information to ensure the data represented the demographics of children receiving special education services by exceptionality, gender, race / ethnicity, and age.

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

Please see the attachment for this indicator for Louisiana's 2018 parent involvement survey.

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

LDOE addressed the extent to which the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State in its SPP/APR FFY 2017 submission due February 1, 2019. LDOE also provided the FFY 2017 Parent Survey in its FFY 2017 submission.



## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 8 - Required Actions

## 8 - State Attachments



Louisiana FFY 2018  
Indicator 8 Special E

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2006	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

32

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
24	0	161	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the FFY 2018 APR submission, LDOE used the October 1, 2018 Child Count Report to extract the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category. LDOE then completes a risk ratio analysis for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services, excluding any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 161 LEAs included in the analysis, LDOE identified 24 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 24 LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification through policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric- a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students for special education and related services. The rubric includes topics such as professional development, teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All 24 LEAs completed the review; none of the LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2016	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.62%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

23

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
55	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in any of the following six specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2018 APR submission, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six specific disability categories was extracted from the state's October 1, 2018 Child Count Report. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 170 LEAs, LDOE identified 55 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 55 LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification of their policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric-a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying their practices, policies, and procedures that may have led to inappropriate identification of students based on their race or ethnicity, by disability. All 55 LEAs completed the review, and zero LEAs determined that the instance of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### 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.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.09%	99.14%	98.37%	98.69%	98.59%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
16,834	16,687	98.59%	100%	99.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage



**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

147

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

LDOE identified a total of 147 children for whom parental consent was obtained, but for whom evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline is included below.

Number of Students / Delay

- 65 / 1-15 Days
- 29 / 16-30 Days
- 19 / 31-45 Days
- 14 / 46-60 Days
- 20 / 60+ Days

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

- inaccurate data entry
- miscalculation of evaluation dates
- delayed reports of outside agencies
- delayed receipt of medical documents

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The FFY 2018 Indicator 11 data was extracted from Louisiana’s Special Education Reporting System (SER). Evaluation timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed Parental Consent-to-Evaluate form. SER has a series of system checks that aid in ensuring data accuracy, including a Business Day calendar that may be generated for calculations of 45 and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.

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

1. LDOE gathers data from SER after the end of the 2018-2019 school year.
2. LDOE identifies LEAs who appear noncompliant and offers them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. LDOE identifies LEAs with cases of non-compliance.
4. LDOE conducts outreach to LEA Special Education Directors, providing them with information on evaluations that exceeded the 60-day timelines in the absence of an approved extension.
5. LEAs that were identified as non-compliant submit a plan of action that indicates the reason for the non-compliance, a description of what could have been done to keep the evaluation compliant, a list of actions taken to ensure non-compliance will not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.
6. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after noncompliance is identified.
7. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

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

The State reported 210 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016. The number of findings in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016 of the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is inaccurate. LDOE reported on the correction of the remaining 210 findings of noncompliance identified in 2016. Please see the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017 attachment for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2017, Louisiana reported findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State verified that LEAs corrected instances of noncompliance. The State initiated follow-up actions within the required timelines to verify corrections consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The State verified timeline reports from data collected in Louisiana’s Special Education Reporting (SER) system which indicated correction of noncompliance. LEAs were correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements. The State ensured that measures of correction as submitted in the corrective action plan were implemented with fidelity.

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

The State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by requiring LEAs to submit and implement a corrective Plan of Action which included activities to ensure compliance, correction, and identification of practical methods to avoid slippage regarding evaluation timelines in the future. The State verified the completion of corrective action activities by conducting outreach to the LEA. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP

Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of noncompliance is achieved when the LEA reached 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and FFY 2016 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining 210 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and the 228 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and FFY 2017: (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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**11 - Required Actions**

**11 - State Attachments**



Louisiana FFY 2018  
Indicator 11 Correcti

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### 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.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	64.60%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.91%	98.47%	97.59%	97.71%	96.16%

#### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,712
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	77
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,390
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	19
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	186
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	1,390	1,430	96.16%	100%	97.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**  
40

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

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

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**Louisiana FFY 2018 Indicator 12 Reasons for Non-Compliance and Range of Days**

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

There are two components to LDOE's data collection method:

First, LDOE engages in a monthly review of relevant data. IDEA Part C program staff, managed by Louisiana's Department of Health and Hospitals, provides LDOE monthly reports and eligibility data. LDOE's Part B staff, including the Indicator 12 manager, collaborate with LDOE's data analytics personnel to identify children who were referred and determined to be NOT eligible, and whose eligibility was determined prior to his/her third birthday.

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

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

Please see attachment for this indicator, under Reports, containing the Accessibility Report verifying Reasons for Non-Compliance document is 508 compliant.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	5	0	2

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year.

LEAs are notified of the non-compliance on a yearly basis by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They are asked to provide a response to a Plan of Action document. The Plan of Action must include the reason for non-compliance and the LEA's plan for correcting any future non-compliance.

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

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	2	0	2
FFY 2015	2	1	1

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Out of the two LEAs, one was notified that their program was in uncorrected non-compliance by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They were asked to submit a Plan of Action to indicate measures their LEA would take to ensure that non-compliance does not occur in the future. The uncorrected non-compliance was due to significant staff turnover in the special education department of the LEA, including the personnel responsible for scheduling transition meetings. New staff were unfamiliar with procedures for ensuring transitions were occurring according to required timelines and that data entered into SER was periodically checked for accuracy. Staff from the LDOE continue to provide targeted assistance to this particular LEA in an effort to resolve the issues that caused so many of the delays.

The second LEA closed at the end of FFY 2017. At the end of the school year, the LEA had not corrected noncompliance.

**FFY 2015**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The 619 Coordinator continues to receive a Statewide Summary Report that reports Part C transition compliance for LEAs. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance on a yearly basis by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They are asked to provide a response to a Plan of Action document. The Plan of Action must include the reason for non-compliance and the LEA's plan for correcting any future non-compliance.

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

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

**FFY 2015**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

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

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and FFY 2017 is: (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, the remaining two uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, and the remaining seven uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report,

in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, FFY 2016, and 2017: (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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## 12 - Required Actions

## 12 - State Attachments



Louisiana FFY 2018  
Indicator 12 Reason

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### 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 services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2009	53.00%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<b>Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition</b>	<b>Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
551	551	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

For this indicator, Louisiana obtained monitoring results through desk audits, on-site reviews, and self-assessments. The State targeted LEAs for on-site monitoring when they scored at Quartile 1 (the highest risk) of a risk analysis rubric. The rubric considered year to year changes in ELA and Math proficiency on statewide assessments, graduation rate, drop-out rate, and Special Education LEA Determinations.

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

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

LDOE reviewed 63 records and LEAs completed self-assessments on an additional 488 records, for a total of 551 records of youth aged 16 and above reviewed for compliance.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
---	----

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### 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.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

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

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	30.00%	33.00%	33.00%	35.00%	37.00%
A	25.30%	Data	33.42%	34.13%	36.68%	39.48%	39.33%
B	2009	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	79.00%	82.00%
B	55.30%	Data	74.25%	73.27%	72.30%	74.98%	76.93%
C	2009	Target >=	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%
C	73.60%	Data	87.65%	88.19%	87.26%	87.16%	88.30%

### FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	39.00%	39.00%
Target B >=	84.00%	84.00%
Target C >=	96.00%	96.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,032
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,203
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,202
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	190
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	127

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,203	3,032	39.33%	39.00%	39.68%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2,405	3,032	76.93%	84.00%	79.32%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2,722	3,032	88.30%	96.00%	89.78%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

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

Louisiana uses a census method to collect data; the State does not sample. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth, and results are captured in the State's Special Education Reporting (SER) data system. In FFY 2018, LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2018 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

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

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	14
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	60.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	55.56%	50.00%	54.55%	66.67%	50.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	14	50.00%	75.00%	28.57%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Due to the relatively small number of overall cases, the LDOE expects year to year variance in the number of percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. LDOE is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. Therefore, LDOE has developed several processes, including those described below, for resolving disagreements about the provision of a free appropriate public education, payment for services obtained, or a child's eligibility, evaluation, level of services, or placement.

**IEP FACILITATION**

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school systems. Typically, an IEP Facilitator is brought in when parents and school system staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school system can request IEP facilitation; however, since the process is voluntary, both sides must agree to participate. The process can be initiated by request to the Legal Division of the State Department of Education, and the service is provided at no cost to the parent or the school system.

**INFORMAL COMPLAINTS/EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS**

Parents of children with disabilities may file informal complaints. The implementation of the informal complaint/Early Resolution Process (ERP) draws on the traditional model of parents and school systems working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.

**FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION**

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

**MEDIATION**

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school systems regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school systems may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.

Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school systems with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation is a voluntary process, and all parties must agree to participate in order for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location that is convenient to the parties in the dispute. Mediation services are provided by LDOE at no cost to parents and school systems.

A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The discussions in a mediation session are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent due process hearings or civil court proceedings. If the mediation process results in full or partial agreement, the mediator will prepare a written mediation agreement that must be signed by both parties. In addition to describing agreements made in the course of mediation, the mediation agreement will state that all discussions that occurred during the mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in a due process hearing or civil court proceeding. The signed agreement shall be legally binding on both parties and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.

**DUE PROCESS HEARING**

A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an administrative law judge (ALJ) to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school system regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability. Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school system may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability within one year of the date that the alleged action forming the basis of the hearing request was known or should have been known. This one-year limit does not apply if the parents were prevented from requesting the hearing because the school system specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school system withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

Once a request for a hearing is received, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an ALJ to the case, and he or she will be provided with a copy of the hearing request. Otherwise, the request remains confidential. The ALJ will then coordinate a prehearing conference to discuss the hearing process and establish a schedule for activities related to the hearing. Please see attachment for the Introduction for additional information.

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

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 15 - Required Actions

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	17
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	5
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the Introduction page for more information.

**Historical Data**

Baseline	2005	81.80%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
Data	100.00%	88.89%	33.33%	71.43%	50.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5	7	17	50.00%	82.00%	70.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**16 - Required Actions**



**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**



Louisiana SSIP  
Phase III 2018 with 2

## Overall APR Attachments



Louisiana FFY 2018  
Needs Assistance Re

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

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

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

#### **Name:**

Kristi-Jo Preston

#### **Title:**

Director, Special Education Policy

#### **Email:**

kristijo.preston@la.gov

#### **Phone:**

2253424141

#### **Submitted on:**

04/30/20 1:01:42 PM

## ED Attachments



LA-B Dispute  
Resolution 2018-19.



LA-2020DataRubric  
PartB.pdf



2020 HTDMD Part  
B.pdf



la-resultsmatrix-202  
0b.pdf



LA-aprltr-2020b.pdf