

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Louisiana



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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

Louisiana Department of Education's (LDOE) general supervision system is an integrated system of oversight and support intended to (1) ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs; (2) ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents or guardians are protected; (3) assist States, localities, educational service agencies and federal agencies to provide for the education of all children with disabilities; and (4) assist and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities leading to improved outcomes. The components described below are part of an interconnected system designed to ensure compliance and drive our state toward meeting expectations regarding federal and state requirements.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Louisiana specifically sought technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) who helps states collect, report, analyze, and use high-quality data. This partnership has provided comprehensive on-site and virtual assistance to Louisiana's team. Louisiana's team also participates in the Data Quality Peer Groups, DMS support structures, IDEA Leadership Conference and HOLA events. Louisiana's State Director also participates in the medium state cohort hosted by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). As a result of IDC support, Louisiana has completed data protocols and decided to move the IDEA data manager to the special education team. See attachment for full technical assistance response and actions Louisiana took.

Louisiana is also including a link to a visual of our monitoring system since we had limited characters below:

[https://go.boarddocs.com/la/bese/Board.nsf/files/CY2P2A6278A3/\\$file/AGII_IDEAMonitoringOverview_Dec2023.pdf](https://go.boarddocs.com/la/bese/Board.nsf/files/CY2P2A6278A3/$file/AGII_IDEAMonitoringOverview_Dec2023.pdf)

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

194

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (SPP/APR)

The SPP/APR is the state's improvement plan for special education and evaluates performance annually; it is centered on stakeholder feedback. LDOE is committed to communicating our SPP/APR annually to stakeholders, including our state Special Education Advisory Panel, special education leaders, and system leadership teams. In alignment to the 17 SPP/APR indicators, LDOE issues annual LEA determinations, which include data on child outcomes, graduation rates, dropout rates, least restrictive environment, achievement/assessment results, and postsecondary outcomes. LEA determinations use the same OSEP categories as state determinations. LDOE posts its annual determination on the website and provides LEA determinations through a secure portal and posts online LEA Performance Profiles.

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

LDOE's policies regarding the provision of FAPE to students with disabilities are included in the following state bulletins specific to special education: Bulletins 1706, 1530, 1508, 1922, 1573, and 1903 (<https://bese.louisiana.gov/policy>). There are additional state policies that also intersect special education; for example our Bulletin 746 includes certification requirements that includes qualifications of special educators. LEAs must have policies and procedures consistent with IDEA and state bulletins and sign annual assurances that those are in alignment with federal and state regulations.

FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING

Annually, LDOE receives federal funds to provide special education and related services to children with disabilities within the state. The majority of funds must be distributed by LDOE to LEAs. LDOE is responsible for monitoring subrecipients to ensure that the IDEA Part B program is effectively implemented and funds are used for authorized purposes and in accordance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms/conditions of the subaward. Procedures are used to standardize the oversight, evaluation, and monitoring guidelines of each LEA. Federal regulatory provisions under which LDOE monitors for fiscal accountability and compliance are the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Grant Guidance or Uniform Guidance), and IDEA Part B. LDOE also uses an electronic grants management system to administer, monitor and provide direct feedback to LEAs on their allocations. Fiscal monitoring is conducted annually for subrecipients using a risk-based assessment including but not limited to: total awarded and expended funds; previous fiscal, programmatic and single audit findings.

DATA ON PROCESSES AND RESULTS

The majority of special education data is collected through LDOE's Special Education Reporting (SER) online system, which was modernized and enhanced over the past year, and our Student Information System. Data processes and procedures are included in a SER manual, and the LDOE data team hosts monthly data manager calls and administers an annual data calendar. The LDOE data team, special education team, and indicator managers meet weekly to discuss data collection, analyze data and determine state priorities and next steps.

INTEGRATED MONITORING

LDOE recognizes its duty to ensure statutory and regulatory requirements related to federal education programs are followed and program activities, supports, and services are achieving intended outcomes. LDOE's Office of Statewide Monitoring monitors the IDEA programs using a model of Continuous Improvement Monitoring. The model is a 3-prong cohesive model that includes: risk-based monitoring which now includes complaints, SPP/APR reporting, fiscal monitoring and the management of results at each level. Where our student centered monitoring occurs at the risk-based level, the process utilizes a tiered system of rank through the stakeholder approved risk-based selection process. This allows for a deeper dive into data, 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, 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 include: 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.

EFFECTIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

LDOE is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. LDOE administers several processes as described below. Recently, LDOE hired a special education ombudsperson, and LDOE updated its call center to include an option to connect parents directly with the ombudsperson. The LDOE offers the following processes and more detail can be found on the dispute resolution webpage: <https://louisianabelieves.com/students-with-disabilities/dispute-resolution>.

- 1) IEP FACILITATION - a voluntary process available to parents and school systems at no cost to assist parents and school system staff with communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student.
- 2) INFORMAL COMPLAINTS/EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS - parents may file; 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.
- 3) FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION - parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written request
- 4) MEDIATION - voluntary and available at no cost 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.
- 5) DUE PROCESS HEARING - 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.

IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTION, INCENTIVES AND SANCTIONS

Improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions are all intended to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and ensure compliance. Bulletin 1922 outlines actions LDOE may take. There is cross-office integration between the legal office, data and assessment analysis, monitoring and our special education team where targeted needs may be identified as a result of various reviews. If LDOE issues a finding of noncompliance for an LEA then the LEA must correct the noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification. The LEA may be required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or a Special Master may be assigned to the LEA to assist them with correction and improvement. LDOE policy states funds may be directed to address specific concerns or funding may be withheld following a required hearing by the state's board. LDOE also uses incentives like competitive funding opportunities and leveraging state IDEA set aside dollars to offer additional opportunities to school systems with accountability labels indicating students with disabilities are struggling.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-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

School Improvement Team

The School Improvement Team is the primary support vehicle for school systems, providing immediate, differentiated, targeted assistance to school systems. The Team targets Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) schools, and the Team includes School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) who work collaboratively with school system leaders to draft cooperative agreements, analyze data, and determine the School Improvement Best Practice(s) (SIBP) that best meet the needs of school system, educators, and students. Leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their school systems and build upon strengths to support implementation of the SIBPs through collaboratively analyzing data, strengths and opportunities for growth, a school improvement plan, observations and reflective feedback. The SIBPs strategy is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2023-2024 school year. LDOE has partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to develop, implement, and support five SIBPs. The five best practices are:

- instructional leadership team support,
- teacher collaboration support,
- teaching standards support,
- principal standards support, and
- career pipeline support.

129 school systems are currently receiving support with instructional leadership teams, and of those, 64 are also receiving support in teacher collaboration. Additionally, the SISS is the school system's primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic questions—including IDEA-related questions, accommodating the needs of the school system.

Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a 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.

Teacher Leader Advisors

Teacher Leader Advisors are a group of exceptionally talented group of educators who play an influential role in raising expectations for students and ensuring that fellow educators have access to high-quality instructional materials and resources, and curriculum-aligned professional development. Teacher Leader Advisors participate in the LDOE's instructional materials review and create tools for the Teacher Support Toolbox, and they develop and lead professional development for educators across the state, including a group of special education Teacher Leaders.

Special Education Director Support

LDOE provides technical assistance through monthly office hours with Special Education Directors in LEAs where targeted assistance can be provided

and monthly question/answer sessions are conducted. Additional monthly calls are held for federal program staff, assessment staff, principals, literacy supervisors, teaching and learning staff and data managers. Communities of practice are also offered for programs serving young children with disabilities.

PLANNING RESOURCES

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

1) Special Education Playbook for System Leaders

LDOE's Special Education Playbook for System Leaders compiles years of research on best instructional practice to support students with disabilities into one document and recommends three best instructional practices to support improving outcomes for students with disabilities: 1) focus on high-quality, inclusive core instruction, 2) extra time for intervention, and 3) content strong staff.

2) Guidance for Leading Inclusive Special Education Programs

To support the increased effectiveness of special education programming through effective, inclusive systemwide planning, LDOE released multiple guidance documents to school systems in 2022-2023 along with webinars. Topics include creating compliant systems, leveraging data, inclusive, accessible learning, positive behavior intervention, and more.

3) School System Leader Planning Resources and Framework

LDOE's School System Planning Guide resource serves to assist LEAs with effective planning each year that leads to improved outcomes for students. This document includes planning to support diverse learners and funding guidance to support students with disabilities, providing guidance on how a school system will build a plan and submit a Super App for formula and competitive funds to support that plan.

4) Super App

Super App is an online application that communicates school system priorities for the next school year and consolidates the process for approval of formula and competitive funds. It includes specific special education planning for LEAs including how the LEA will: 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) Professional Learning Roadmap

The LDOE's Professional Learning Roadmap provides a clear pathway for school systems and schools to align their priorities to improve instructional practice through three essential professional learning structures: instructional leadership teams (ILTs), teacher collaboration, and career pipeline that follow the High Quality Professional Learning Cycle and based on cycles of continuous improvement. The roadmap describes processes for these key structures and requires special education leaders be included on instructional leadership teams.

6) Literacy Planning

LDOE has developed and released a variety of literacy resources for LEAs, educators and families.

7) School System Planning Calls

These calls are 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, 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 more. LDOE integrates 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 more.

More information on LDOE's support structures 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 children with disabilities.

LDOE provides multiple opportunities for professional development to LEAs aimed at building their capacity to improve outcomes, including but not limited to:

Special Education Regional Tour

Recently, the special education team conducted regional support for school system leadership teams, including Superintendents, Chief Academic Officers and Special Education Directors of LEAs to build capacity around best instructional practices to support students with disabilities.

Special Education Leader Collaboratives

LDOE's special education team meets at least three times per year in-person with Special Education Directors from across the state to engage in professional development on a variety of topics, dive into data and SPP/APR measures, network with their colleagues from across the state, and intentionally strategize to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Special Education Fellowship

Special Education Fellow Academy is a year-long, comprehensive development program for novice special education leaders across the state with 0-3 years of experience in the role of special education supervision. The fellowship provides in-person training, coaching, a community of practice, and a mentorship that will instill the knowledge and skills the next generation of leaders need to lead and sustain change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Aspiring Special Education Fellowship

To promote recruitment in our state for rising leaders, the Aspiring Special Education Fellows are a cohort of teachers, related services providers or other school leaders who are not yet special education supervisors but who aspire to become special education leaders in their school systems.

School Support Institutes

School Support Institutes are annual regional events that build the instructional capacity of school-based instructional leadership teams by providing the most current and relevant professional learning to establish and maintain coherent, well-organized instructional programs that meet the diverse needs of all students. Louisiana's most struggling schools or schools with Comprehensive Intervention Required and Urgent Intervention Required labels are required to be in attendance.

Teacher Leader Summit

The LDOE's Teacher Leader Summit is an annual event that brings together over 4,000 system leaders and teacher leaders for a multi-day professional development event. Objectives of this annual event include improving the everyday practice of Louisiana leaders and educators, providing opportunities for collaboration and sharing best practices, introducing high-quality strategies, resources, and professional development and fostering an empowering, engaging and inspiring culture among educators. The event includes a track of sessions designed specifically to support educators with improving

outcomes for students with disabilities and ensuring high quality teaching and learning for all students.

Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a 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.

Teacher Leader Advisors

Teacher Leader Advisors are a group of exceptionally talented group of educators who play an influential role in raising expectations for students and ensuring that fellow educators have access to high-quality instructional materials and resources, and curriculum-aligned professional development. Teacher Leader Advisors participate in the LDOE's instructional materials review and create tools for the Teacher Support Toolbox. Additionally, they develop and lead professional development for educators across the state.

Literacy Regional Tour

LDOE's literacy team also hosts an annual regional literacy tour to support system leaders with planning for and providing high quality literacy instruction and intervention.

Competitive Funding For Professional Development

Annually, LDOE leverages IDEA state set aside funds to offers assistance to LEAs with schools with accountability labels due to performance of their students with disabilities. This opportunity allows for additional professional development to build capacity of administrators and educators to provide specialized supports to students with disabilities.

More information on LDOE's professional learning structures can be found on the website: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/school-system-support-toolbox>

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)

Related Services Advisory Commission
Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
Early Literacy Commission
Teacher Leader Advisors
Families Helping Families
Exceptional Lives Louisiana
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

10

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input. Parent engagement mostly occurred via the following:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
Families Helping Families parent centers
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
Statewide stakeholder engagement partnerships

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The LDOE solicited feedback from the following diverse groups quarterly to increase parent capacity:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
Families Helping Families, Louisiana's parent centers
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council

The LDOE used Back-to-School Guides for Parents of Students with Disabilities, the School System Planning Monthly Calls, and the Superintendent's Weekly Newsletter to promote and encourage relevant stakeholders to participate in implementation activities. Specifically this year, the LDOE also released a Family Engagement Toolkit, family literacy supports, and family math supports aimed at building capacity for diverse families with at-home supports to support improving outcomes. The LDOE also uses the annual parent engagement survey to increase capacity of diverse groups of parents.

The LDOE funds ten regional parent and family support partnerships with Families Helping Families regional center. They support thousands of parents, families and students with disabilities across Louisiana annually. Funding requirements and assurances require reporting and partnership with LDOE on consultations conducted, attending IEP meetings with parents as requested, in-person and virtual capacity building sessions with families on various topics, including dispute resolution, supporting literacy, EarlySteps information, transition, developing the IEP, and much more.

Most recently, LDOE added a new position and hired a special education ombudsman, which is resulting in further support for parents and a direct line of communication and support to parents. All of these components together allow us to increase and build capacity of diverse groups of parents.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Louisiana remains committed to a comprehensive vision for student success in our state with every child on track to a college degree or professional career. Louisiana continues to engage stakeholders at our Special Education Advisory Panel meetings, Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council, Families Helping Families Centers and other commissions and all stakeholders through our special education reporting and funding website: <https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>. The LDOE issues an annual input survey to parents of students with disabilities each year.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. The target setting results, data analysis, development and evaluation of improvement strategies will be available to the public using this Target Setting webpage.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, 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 has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, 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.

OSEP notes that the "State Improvement System IDEA Monitoring Oversight" attachment included in the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission is not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	76.45%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Data	52.50%	59.29%	64.73%	76.45%	74.72%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy

supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,843
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	646
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	139
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	46
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,005

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,843	4,679	74.72%	80.00%	60.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During data review and analysis, while we had more students with disabilities exit with a regular diploma than last year it was also noted that several hundred more students with disabilities were reported as dropping out this year, and this impacted slippage. Last year, data analysis revealed that alternate diplomas were not reported, and that has been corrected which increased the denominator this year. Recently in a quarterly LEA special education director meeting (January 2024), State staff reviewed all indicators and data, reviewed LEA determinations and focused in on indicator 1 and 2. Emphasis was made on correctly exiting students with disabilities in the special education reporting system.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Students in Louisiana can pursue one of two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma. The TOPS University diploma pathway requires students to earn 24 credits and prepares them for four-year colleges and universities. The Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma pathway requires students to earn 23 credits and equips them with the skills and industry-valued credentials, or Industry Based Certifications (IBC), to move into a chosen industry after high school. 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 with IEPs have the option to pursue either the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech diploma. However, the April Dunn Act (2014) gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue a high school diploma by meeting graduation requirements through alternate means. 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 April Dunn Act eligible students include the following:

1) Meet all graduation requirements, which include earning all Carnegie units and statewide credentials for the diploma pathway they are pursuing and demonstrating proficiency in the courses assessed by the state assessment, LEAP 2025. If a student is unable to meet the state-established benchmarks - scoring proficient - on the LEAP 2025 assessment requirements through traditional means, 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**1 - Required Actions**

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	37.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	27.00%	25.00%	25.00%	20.00%	18.00%
Data	24.31%	20.58%		17.08%	19.17%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,843
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	646
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	139
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	46
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,005

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,005	4,679	19.17%	16.00%	21.48%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During data review and analysis, while we had more students with disabilities exit with a regular diploma than last year it was also noted that several hundred more students with disabilities were reported as dropping out this year, and this impacted slippage. Data analysis revealed that last year reporting did not include alternate diplomas and it was corrected and included this year, which impacted the denominator. Recently (January 2024) in a LEA special education director meeting, State staff reviewed the SPP/APR and indicators, reviewed LEA determinations, and focused in on indicators 1 and 2 as a result of data review. Emphasis was placed on correctly exiting students with disabilities.

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 s/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

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.50%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	95.63%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	90.73%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	97.43%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	95.46%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	89.15%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor’s Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	7,033	6,591	5,991

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	978	238	233
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	5,245	5,102	4,460
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	694	1,077	963

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	7,020	6,588	5,804
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	951	217	198
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	5,271	5,125	4,334
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	693	1,076	961

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,917	7,033	98.73%	98.80%	98.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,417	6,591	96.84%	98.80%	97.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,656	5,991	93.46%	98.80%	94.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,915	7,020	98.69%	98.80%	98.50%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,418	6,588	96.58%	98.80%	97.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,493	5,804	92.40%	98.80%	94.64%	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.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2023 Regular and Alternate Test Summary results in the Special Education Data section, use the following link:
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Louisiana reports comprehensively on children with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and school system.

Louisiana's Spring 2023 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, school system, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.

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>

Furthermore, Louisiana has a webpage dedicated to special education reporting. This webpage includes Louisiana's "Special Education Data Profile", which consists of statewide assessment tables, including: 1) children with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and alternate (LEAP Connect) assessments, 2) children with disabilities who scored proficient on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) children with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LEAP Connect assessment. The webpage also includes each LEA's Performance Profile, which reports on the LEA's performance against the State's targets in the APR. The Special Education Reporting and Funding page is available at <https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	16.49%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	9.39%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	7.69%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	12.40%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.88%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.59%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	19.50%	21.50%	23.50%	25.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	12.50%	14.50%	16.50%	18.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	15.50%	17.50%	19.50%	21.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	15.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	6,223	5,340	4,693
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	560	91	90
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	510	506	390

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	6,222	5,342	4,532
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	483	70	70
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	519	272	475

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,070	6,223	18.55%	19.50%	17.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	597	5,340	10.56%	12.50%	11.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	480	4,693	8.69%	10.00%	10.23%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

While statewide students with disabilities grew in both ELA and mathematics for the second year in a row, 4th grade students with disabilities regressed by a percent in reading. This is due to some of our youngest learners, particularly this group of 4th graders, continuing to recover from the impacts of the pandemic. This group of students would have been in 1st and 2nd grade during pandemic impacts and closures. Proficient in Louisiana is scoring mastery or advanced which is a high bar. LDOE is committed to continuing to implement an intentional literacy strategy, accelerate strategy and specific best instructional practices for students with disabilities to continue to improve outcomes of students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,002	6,222	14.85%	15.50%	16.10%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	342	5,342	5.88%	8.00%	6.40%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	545	4,532	8.51%	9.00%	12.03%	Met 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.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2023 results found under the Special Education Data section, use the following link:
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Beginning in FFY 2020, the State defined proficiency as scoring Mastery+ instead of Basic+ on statewide assessments. Louisiana is excited to see continued gains and evidence that statewide evidence-based practices are resulting in learning recovery.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	50.65%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	56.70%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	71.59%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	51.69%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	59.34%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	49.65%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	75.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability;t the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor’s Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency	694	1,077	963

level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	347	606	660

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	693	1,076	961
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	369	664	492

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	347	694	51.61%	54.00%	50.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	606	1,077	57.85%	60.00%	56.27%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	660	963	72.14%	75.00%	68.54%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Slippage for this target is due to increased students who received scores and although the number of students scoring proficient increased from last year, there were more who were not proficient. Louisiana continues to focus heavily on literacy screening and supports, including students with significant disabilities. Continued guidance and curriculum support for students with significant disabilities to access high quality teaching and learning will be an ongoing focus.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage for this target is due to increased students who received scores and although the number of students scoring proficient increased from last year, there were more who were not proficient. Louisiana continues to focus heavily on literacy screening and supports, including students with significant disabilities. Continued guidance and curriculum support for students with significant disabilities to access high quality teaching and learning will be an ongoing focus.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage for this target is due to increased students who received scores and the high school students with significant cognitive disabilities showed the most decline. Louisiana continues to focus heavily on literacy screening and supports, including students with significant disabilities. Continued guidance and curriculum support for students with significant disabilities to access high quality teaching and learning will be an ongoing focus.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	369	693	52.10%	55.00%	53.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	664	1,076	63.01%	62.00%	61.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	492	961	53.19%	53.00%	51.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage for this target is due to increased students who received scores and although the number of students scoring proficient increased from last year, there were more who were not proficient. Louisiana will continue to provide guidance and curriculum support for students with significant disabilities to access high quality teaching and learning.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage for this target is due to increased students who received scores and high school students with disabilities showed a decline in proficiency. Louisiana will continue to provide guidance and curriculum support for students with significant disabilities to access high quality teaching and learning.

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.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2023 results, use the following link where the results are posted under the Special Education Data section:
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Beginning in FFY 2020, States were required to report on this indicator. The State's alternate assessment defines proficiency as Near Goal or above.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	25.28
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	34.71
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	33.50
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.60
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	22.20
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	26.47

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	24.00	23.00	22.00	21.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	33.00	32.00	31.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	32.00	31.00	30.00	29.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	18.00	17.00	16.00	15.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	20.00	19.00	18.00	17.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.00	24.00	23.00	22.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse

representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*FACTS*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED*FACTS* file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,329	49,791	50,504
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,223	5,340	4,693
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19,659	21,203	20,568

d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,773	2,003	1,615
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	560	91	90
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	510	506	390

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,326	49,829	49,005
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,222	5,342	4,532
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	16,334	14,182	17,684
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,722	1,191	1,622
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	483	70	70
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	519	272	475

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17.19%	44.35%	25.66	24.00	27.15	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	11.18%	46.61%	36.13	33.00	35.43	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.23%	43.92%	34.18	32.00	33.70	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Related to indicator 3A, 4th grade students with disabilities dropped a few percent in proficiency therefore also impacting the proficiency gap. This is due to some of our youngest learners, particularly this group of 4th graders, continuing to recover from the impacts of the pandemic. This group of students would have been in 1st and 2nd grade during pandemic impacts and closures. While students with disabilities did show gains and evidence of learning recovery so did all students, thus the achievement gap remains. Proficient in Louisiana is scoring mastery or advanced which is a high bar. Louisiana will continue to implement evidence-based practices to improve this target and close achievement gaps for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.10%	37.36%	21.79	18.00	21.26	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6.40%	30.85%	24.31	20.00	24.45	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.03%	39.40%	26.43	25.00	27.37	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	26.50%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	15.50%	13.50%	13.50%	13.50%	13.50%
Data	18.50%	19.78%	11.92%	7.33%	6.95%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor’s Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
21	198	6.95%	13.00%	10.61%	Met target	No Slippage

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

In Louisiana, an LEA is determined to have significant discrepancy if the LEA meets the criteria defined as:

The LEA has at least 2 students with disabilities (SWD) with OSS greater than 10 days;

The LEA rate of OSS > 10 days is greater than the State threshold (see the following for how the threshold is determined):

Determining State Threshold:

The first step is to calculate the State rate: divide the number of SWD in the State with the OSS > 10 days by the cumulative number of SWD in the State.

The State threshold is calculated by multiplying the State rate by 1.5.

The LEA rate is calculated by dividing the number of SWD in the LEA with OSS > 10 days by the cumulative number of SWD in the LEA.

Any LEA whose rate is greater than the State threshold has significant discrepancy.

For the FFY 2022 APR submission, the State average was 0.724%. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 1.086% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2022 APR generally reflects data from school year 2022-2023. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2021-2022.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

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 review areas including:

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

2. LEAs 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 non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.

4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA had to: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State has revised its methodology for this indicator, and therefore, must reset its baseline and targets.

4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must reset its baseline and targets due to the State's use of a revised methodology.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

27

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	198	0.00%	0%	Not Valid and Reliable	Met target	No Slippage

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

In Louisiana, an LEA is determined to have significant discrepancy if the LEA meets the criteria defined as:

- The LEA has at least 25 students with disabilities (SWD) in the racial/ethnic group being analyzed;
- The LEA has at least 3 SWD with OSS greater than 10 days in the racial/ethnic group being analyzed;
- The LEA rate of OSS > 10 days for the racial/ethnic group being analyzed is greater than the State threshold (see the following for how the threshold is determined):

Determining State Threshold:

The first step is to calculate the State rate: divide the number of SWD in the State with the OSS > 10 days by the cumulative number of SWD in the State.

The State threshold is calculated by multiplying the State rate by 1.5.

The LEA rate is calculated by dividing the number of SWD with OSS > 10 days in the racial/ethnic group being analyzed in the LEA by the cumulative number of SWD in the LEA.

Any LEA whose rate is greater than the State threshold for any racial/ethnic group has significant discrepancy.

As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was 0.724%. Thus, any LEA with a percentage greater than 1.086% for any racial/ethnic group who met the above criteria is considered significantly discrepant.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2022 APR generally reflects data from school year 2021-2022. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2021-2022.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

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 review 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 non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.

4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA had to: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 198 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 27 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2021 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 ED Facts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	63.50%	64.00%	64.00%	72.00%	72.00%
A	71.98%	Data	60.87%	61.76%	63.93%	71.98%	67.85%
B	2020	Target <=	13.56%	13.50%	13.50%	9.50%	9.50%
B	9.61%	Data	14.66%	14.59%	14.00%	9.61%	13.40%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.20%	1.20%
C	1.29%	Data	1.24%	1.20%	1.22%	1.29%	1.21%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target B <=	9.50%	9.40%	9.40%	9.40%
Target C <=	1.20%	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	90,268
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58,315
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,175
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	414
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	141
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	643

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58,315	90,268	67.85%	72.50%	64.60%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,175	90,268	13.40%	9.50%	16.81%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,198	90,268	1.21%	1.20%	1.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
A	Louisiana saw an increase of over 12,000 additional students with IEPs. This increase is the result of State legislation mandating 5 year olds attend Kindergarten. However, Louisiana continues to support inclusive practices for students with disabilities. This is evident in the majority of students with IEPs are inside the regular class more than 80% of the day.						
B	While there are more students with IEPs inside the regular class more than 80% of the day than were reported last year, there was an increase of over 12,000 additional students with IEPs and that increase impacted each of the environment indicators. The increases are spread across all environments, but Louisiana continues to support inclusive practices for students with disabilities.						
C	While there are more students with IEPs inside the regular class more than 80% of the day than were reported last year, there was an increase of over 12,000 additional students with IEPs and that increase impacted each of the environment indicators. The increases are spread across all environments, but Louisiana continues to support inclusive practices for students with disabilities.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	16.25%	16.50%
A	Data	20.27%	18.57%	17.75%	16.21%	15.10%
B	Target <=	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	5.00%	5.00%
B	Data	5.06%	5.14%	4.90%	5.77%	6.66%
C	Target <=				3.34%	3.34%
C	Data				3.34%	3.53%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	16.21%
B	2020	5.77%
C	2020	3.34%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	17.00%	17.25%	17.50%	18.00%

Target B <=	4.90%	4.90%	4.80%	4.80%
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	3.20%	3.20%	3.10%	3.10%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	1,271	2,660	2,717	6,648
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	106	491	557	1,154
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	64	191	143	398
b2. Number of children attending separate school	2	14	19	35
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	1	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	86	46	16	148

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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	1,154	6,648	15.10%	17.00%	17.36%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	434	6,648	6.66%	4.90%	6.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	148	6,648	3.53%	3.20%	2.23%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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 with IEPs assessed)] 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 3 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2010	Target >=	72.00%	72.50%	72.50%	71.50%	72.00%
A1	69.60%	Data	71.37%	68.52%	68.11%	69.15%	69.64%

A2	2010	Target >=	66.00%	66.50%	66.50%	65.00%	65.20%
A2	64.90%	Data	61.44%	50.60%	47.51%	48.73%	57.17%
B1	2010	Target >=	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	72.00%	72.00%
B1	70.90%	Data	71.08%	72.57%	68.90%	66.58%	74.06%
B2	2010	Target >=	59.00%	59.50%	59.50%	57.00%	57.20%
B2	56.20%	Data	55.00%	55.25%	45.99%	46.34%	54.76%
C1	2010	Target >=	76.00%	76.50%	76.50%	72.50%	73.00%
C1	74.70%	Data	74.69%	59.09%	54.70%	60.20%	63.67%
C2	2010	Target >=	71.00%	71.50%	71.50%	60.00%	60.25%
C2	69.00%	Data	65.93%	44.70%	30.79%	31.37%	55.03%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target A2 >=	65.40%	65.60%	65.80%	66.00%
Target B1 >=	72.50%	72.50%	73.00%	73.00%
Target B2 >=	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%
Target C1 >=	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
Target C2 >=	60.50%	60.75%	70.00%	70.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,214

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	51	2.13%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	615	25.64%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	416	17.34%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	663	27.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	654	27.26%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,079	1,745	69.64%	72.50%	61.83%	Did not meet target	Slippage
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>	1,317	2,399	57.17%	65.40%	54.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	37	1.54%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	609	25.39%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	467	19.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	776	32.35%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	510	21.26%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	1,243	1,889	74.06%	72.50%	65.80%	Did not meet target	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>	1,286	2,399	54.76%	57.40%	53.61%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	62	2.58%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	688	28.68%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	387	16.13%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	699	29.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	563	23.47%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,086	1,836	63.67%	73.50%	59.15%	Did not meet target	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,262	2,399	55.03%	60.50%	52.61%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.
A2	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.
B1	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.
B2	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.
C1	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.
C2	Louisiana does not have universal prek and stakeholders and providers continue to report pandemic-related challenges to support young children with disabilities. Additional challenges impacting this indicator include workforce retention challenges to provide extensive early intervention services. Louisiana continues to release and support guidance on early intervention and effective programming and offer competitive funding support.

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

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

Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are input into the TS GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores for each functional outcome. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of the TS GOLD are found at https://teachingstrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2020-Tech-Manual_GOLD.pdf. 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)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

In reporting the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program, the State reported 2,399 as the denominator in outcomes A, B, and C; however, the State reported 2,214 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs were assessed. The State must explain this discrepancy.

7 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, the State must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2023 total number assessed and the FFY 2023 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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 3 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments,

which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	39.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	82.50%	83.50%	83.50%	84.50%	85.50%
Data	83.25%	85.71%	84.31%	86.88%	82.85%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	86.50%	87.50%	88.50%	89.50%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
273	333	82.85%	86.50%	81.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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. Participating LEAs disseminate the survey to parents of all children with disabilities, including preschool children. LDOE's FFY 2022 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 2022, approximately 8.4% of survey respondents were parents of preschool students with disabilities.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

13,631

Percentage of respondent parents

2.44%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	3.50%	2.44%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Louisiana reviews representativeness by gender, age range, race, and geographic area for school age and early childhood. For FFY 2022, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The responses were analyzed to determine representativeness by comparing the survey data to the child count demographic data for the appropriate year. Under and over representation was determined by category when the difference is +/- 3.00 percentage points. A category of +3.00 was considered over representative while -3.00 was considered under represented.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

After review of the State's special education parent involvement survey, beginning FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The parent survey considered the following categories:

- race/ethnicity;
- gender;
- age;
- geographic location (urban or rural).

In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services. The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 49% Black or African -American, followed by 42% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%. The percent of students with disabilities in the remaining ethnic groups - Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or Two or More Races - are all less than 5%. The percent of respondents for each of these ethnic groups are less than 5%.

Because Louisiana selects a sampling based on the methodology described below and one that selects participants representative of the student population each year, the sampling method helps to ensure the demographics are representative of the children receiving services.

Please see Indicator 8 attachment for the FFY 2022 special education parent involvement survey.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Historically, Louisiana has reported low response rates for the special education parent involvement survey. For FFY 2022, the LDOE offered assistance to parents with completing the survey instead of the option to complete the online survey. LDOE partnered with Families Helping Families and the PTIC to assist parents in completion of the survey. While the survey was available online, LDOE understood the need to offer families another method besides completing the survey electronically. With this method, LDOE staff read the survey questions to the respondent, and the answers were recorded in the online survey. School systems were also provided with a QR code for the survey to share with parents. The QR code allowed parents to easily access the survey on a mobile device.

To increase the response rate from FFY 2023 onward, the LDOE will continue to provide multiple ways for parents to engage with and complete the survey. Additionally, LDOE through communities of practice, the Diverse Learners Office Hours and Teaching and Learning calls will communicate processes and provide support to LEAs to improve the response rate.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The analysis of response rate for nonresponse bias included consideration and comparison of children with disabilities by geographical area (rural or urban), by gender, ages for children represented, race of children with disabilities in the state, and children's exceptionality and using +/-3. The majority of students with disabilities represented were from rural areas at 64% and urban represented 37%; the majority of the state population is opposite, but in looking at LEAs represented, there were not a lot of large urban LEAs in this sampling so this representation is indicative of the LEAs surveyed. When considering gender, 72% of respondents' children were male, which is 5% more than the total percent of children with disabilities who are male statewide (67%). 28% of respondents' children were female, which is 5% less than the total percent of children with disabilities who are female statewide (33%). Increasing our response rate will hopefully increase the percent of children with disabilities who are female closer to the state representation.

When considered race, there were several analyses that stood out. Particularly, only 39% of respondents' children were African American, which is 8%

less than the state average of 47%. 49% of respondents' children were Caucasian while the state average is 42%, so 7% more children represented than the state average. Hispanic children with disabilities were represented at 3% and the state average for children with disabilities who are Hispanic is 6% so right at -3. Other races were on par with state average. Louisiana would like to see that children who are African American and Hispanic are more represented in responses. Louisiana does offer the survey in multiple languages in hopes to increase accessibility and friendliness. Another important analysis was that of children represented by exceptionality. Interestingly, Louisiana saw 21% of children with disabilities represented by respondents had an autism exceptionality. That is more than double our state average, so we saw a large number of those children represented. Students with developmental disability were also overrepresented by +4, and multiple disability was overrepresented. Intellectual disability was underrepresented by -5 and Other Health Impairment by -9 and Specific Learning Disability by -17. Speech Language Impairment analysis is representative of the state representation as was Emotional Disturbance, Orthopedic Impairment, and Hearing Impaired.

The sampling plan and outreach to parents within the regions surveyed and support for completing the survey are intentional ways Louisiana supports a more representative response from parents and children representative of our population.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
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 118,000 students with disabilities, ages 3-21, in LEAs ranging in size from single school charter schools to districts with over 40,000 students. To reach this diverse range of districts, charter schools, and students, LDOE continues to use its statistically valid sampling plan for FFY 2020 – FFY 2025. Louisiana uses a two-step process to develop the sampling plan. The first step focuses on which LEAs will be sampled each year. The second step focuses on which students with disabilities would be included in each LEA.

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

Louisiana uses a multi-step process that considers a number of variables to ensure that each year's sample is representative of the state as whole. Louisiana stratified the population into three groups: 1) traditional LEAs— include parish and city school districts and state special schools, 2) Type 2 charter schools, and 3) Type 5 charters and other non-traditional LEAs. Additionally, LEAs were stratified to ensure geographic (northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest) as well as urban, suburban, and rural representation across the state. Each of these LEAs will be sampled once during FFY 2020 – FFY 2025. Louisiana used statistical software to randomly assign LEAs within each group to one of the six survey years.

Louisiana conducts a series of additional analyses to ensure that the survey years contain a sample that will be representative of the state as a whole in disability, race, age and gender. Each year is found to be representative, ensuring a valid and reliable sample. OSEP requires that any LEA 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. Furthermore, the LDOE will provide a QR code in addition to the letters for parents to better access the survey. Each LEA will be required to disseminate letters along with the QR code 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.

See attachment for full methodology and considerations.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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. In addition, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

In its description of its FFY 2022 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Specifically, the State reported, "In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial

demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services."

The State reported that its FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. The State indicated, "The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 49% Black or African-American, followed by 42% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%." However, when analyzing the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, the State reported "When considered race, there were several analyses that stood out. Particularly, only 39% of respondents' children were African American, which is 8% less than the state average of 47%. 49% of respondents' children were Caucasian while the state average is 42%, so 7% more children represented than the state average." Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the data are representative.

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Measurement Table.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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 response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 the reporting year, 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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.

54

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
30	0	140	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 n 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.

1. Data Analysis. LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the SPP/APR, LDOE uses the annual 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 find whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of identification 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.

2. Communication with LEAs. LDOE conducts outreach to the LEAs identified to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification through policies, practices, or procedures. The LEAs are 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.

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 is 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 because of inappropriate identification, the LEA must revise its policies, practices, and procedures to address this concern.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 section 618 data for the reporting year, 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). 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 specific disability categories 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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.

79

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
84	0	115	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 n size of 25 for over representation based on one year of data. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE uses a two-step process.

1. Data Analysis. 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 SPP/APR, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six specific disability categories is extracted from the annual Child Count Report. LDOE reviews the data and excludes any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category.

2. Communication with LEAs. LDOE conducts outreach to the LEAs identified to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification of their policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs are 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.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.59%	99.13%	98.01%	89.57%	99.56%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
17,893	17,652	99.56%	100%	98.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

241

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 241 children for whom parental consent was obtained, but from whom evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline is included below:

- (143) 1-15 days
- (43) 16-30 days
- (20) 31-45 days
- (12) 46-60 days
- (23) 60+ days

The majority of delayed evaluations were completed within 60+ days of the deadline. LEAs identified the following primary reasons for delay:

- staff shortages
- 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 2022 Indicator 11 data was extracted from Louisiana's Special Education Reporting (SER) System. 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 used a standard process for data collection, determination of non-compliance, and issuance of findings:

1. LDOE gathered data from SER after the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
2. LDOE identified LEAs who appear noncompliant and offered them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. LDOE identified LEAs with cases of non-compliance via written, formal notification.
4. LDOE conducted outreach to LEA Special Education Supervisors, 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 submitted a plan of action that indicated 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. The indicator 11 manager worked directly with LEAs identified.
6. LEAs were 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 OSEP Memo QA 23-01, compliance reports were reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance was achieved when the LEA reached 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
68	68	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2022, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance was corrected for each case of noncompliance in FFY 2021. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Child Find collection data collected through the State’s SER data system;
- Verification of correction from prior year’s noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Child Find report; and
- A review of evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all local education agencies (LEAs) as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates identified in FFY 2021. After receipt of this information, which was disseminated via the LDOE data systems’ secure File Transfer Portal (FTP), LEAs were required to submit an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE Child Find manager. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation exceeded the 60-day timeline, the number of days, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible. Therefore, the Child Find manager ensured each individual student evaluation is completed, though it was late.

In any instance whereby an LEA was found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs’ updated procedures were submitted to the Child Find manager via the secure FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEA’s Plan of Action to determine if the LEA had revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. To verify OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Child Find collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs have corrected their noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

For the FFY 2023, the Child Find manager in conjunction with the IDEA program office runs subsequent Child Find Performance reports and review monitoring results to ensure LEAs comply with evaluation timelines and regulatory requirements. Child Find collection data will be reviewed from the IDEA compliance protocol for each LEA monitored by identifying whether evaluation timelines were met. LEAs must correct the noncompliance immediately once the monitoring report is received; however, the data will serve as a resource to the Child Find manager as it relates to systemic compliance and recommendation for professional development relative to Child Find.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance was reflected in the Child Find collection data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- has completed the evaluation, although late for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all initial evaluations conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Child Find collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation within a 60-day timeline had a subsequent eligibility determination made.

During FFY 2022, the State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2021 within one year.

The LDOE did not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification was data-driven. LDOE ran a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year’s APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1,584	1,584	0
FFY 2019	247	247	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance was corrected. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Child Find collection data collected through the State’s SER data system;
- Verification of correction from prior year’s noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Child Find report; and
- A review of evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all LEAs as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which was disseminated via the LDOE data systems’ secure FTP, LEAs were required to submit an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE Child Find manager. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation exceeded the 60-day timeline, the number of days, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible.

In any instance whereby an LEA was found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Child Find manager via the FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEA's Plan of Action to determine if the LEA had revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. To verify OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Child Find collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs had corrected their noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

For the FFY 2022, the Child Find manager in conjunction with the IDEA program office ran subsequent Child Find Performance reports and reviewed monitoring results to ensure LEAs complied with evaluation timelines and regulatory requirements. Child Find collection data was reviewed from the IDEA compliance protocol for each LEA monitored by identifying whether evaluation timelines were met. LEAs were required to correct the noncompliance immediately once the monitoring report was received; however, the data served as a resource to the Child Find manager as it relates to systemic compliance and recommendation for professional development relative to Child Find.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2020 was reflected in the Child Find collection data:

- correctly implemented 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- completed the evaluation, although late for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all initial evaluations conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Child Find collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation in FFY 2020 within a 60-day timeline had a subsequent eligibility determination made.

During FFY 2021, the State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2020 within one year.

The LDOE did not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification was data-driven. LDOE ran a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2020, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance in FFY 2019 was corrected. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Child Find collection data collected through the State's SER data system;
- Verified correction from prior year's noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Child Find report; and
- Reviewed evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all LEAs as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance in FFY 2019 and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which was disseminated via the LDOE data systems' secure FTP, LEAs submitted an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE Child Find manager. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation exceeded the 60-day timeline, the number of days, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible. The Child Find Manager ensured for each case that the evaluation was completed.

In any instance whereby an LEA was found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Child Find manager via the secure FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEA's Plan of Action to determine if the LEA had revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. To verify OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Child Find collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs had corrected their noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

The Child Find manager in conjunction with the IDEA program office ran subsequent Child Find Performance reports and reviewed monitoring results to ensure LEAs complied with evaluation timelines and regulatory requirements. Child Find collection data was reviewed from the IDEA compliance protocol for each LEA monitored by identifying whether evaluation timelines were met. LEAs corrected the noncompliance immediately once the monitoring report was received; however, the data served as a resource to the Child Find manager as it relates to systemic compliance and recommendation for professional development relative to Child Find.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2019 was reflected in the Child Find collection data:

- correctly implemented 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- completed the evaluation, although late for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all initial evaluations conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Child Find collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation within a 60-day timeline had a subsequent eligibility determination made.

During FFY 2020, the State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2019 within one year.

The LDOE did not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification was data-driven. LDOE ran a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reported on their current standing in the current APR.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 1,584 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and remaining 247 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and 2019: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 68 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, 1,584 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, and 247 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFYs 2021, 2020, and 2019: (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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.60%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.16%	97.20%	96.99%	82.78%	83.15%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,433
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	82

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,001
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.	1
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	337
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	1,001	1,013	83.15%	100%	98.82%	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

12

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.

Louisiana's FFY 2022 Indicator 12 Reason for Non Compliance and Range of Days Chart is attached.

Attach PDF table (optional)

Louisiana FFY 2022 Indicator 12 Reason 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, provides LDOE monthly reports and eligibility data. LDOE's Part B staff, including the Early Childhood Coordinator, 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 Early Childhood Coordinator 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
31	31	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2022, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 was corrected. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Indicator 12 collection data collected through the state's special education reporting (SER) data system;
- Verified correction from prior year's noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Part C Transition report; and
- Reviewed evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all local education agencies (LEAs) identified in FFY 2021 as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which is disseminated via the LDOE data systems File Transfer Portal (FTP), LEAs submitted an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE IDEA 619 Coordinator. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation and IEP were not implemented by the 3rd birthday, the number of days past due, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible.

In all instances whereby the LEAs were found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Early Childhood Coordinator

via the FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEAs' Plan of Action to determine if the LEA revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. To verify regulatory compliance per OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Indicator 12 collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs corrected their noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance was reflected in the Indicator 12 collection data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- completed the evaluation and IEP, although late for any child whose initial evaluation and IEP were not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State sent noncompliance letters to the LEA listing each individual case. The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all evaluations and IEPs conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Indicator 12 collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation and IEP by the 3rd birthday had a completed evaluation and a subsequent eligibility determination made. The Early Childhood Coordinator works directly with the local 619 coordinators and special education directors to ensure individual noncompliance was corrected on all 31.

The State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation and IEP even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2020 within one year. The Early Childhood Coordinator worked directly with the LEA 619 coordinators or special education supervisor in the identified LEAs with technical assistance to ensure correction.

The LDOE does not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification is data-driven. LDOE runs a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	22	22	0
FFY 2019	33	33	0
FFY 2018	13	13	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance was corrected. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Indicator 12 collection data collected through the state's special education reporting (SER) data system;
- Verification of correction from prior year's noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Part C Transition report; and
- A review of evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all local education agencies (LEAs) identified in FFY 2020 as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which is disseminated via the LDOE data systems File Transfer Portal (FTP), LEAs submitted an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE IDEA 619 Coordinator. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation and IEP were not implemented by the 3rd birthday, the number of days past due, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible.

In all instances whereby the LEAs were found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Early Childhood Coordinator via the FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEAs' Plan of Action to determine if the LEA revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. Per OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Indicator 12 collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs corrected their noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance was reflected in the Indicator 12 collection data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- completed the evaluation and IEP, although late for any child whose initial evaluation and IEP were not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State sent noncompliance letters to the LEA listing each individual case. The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all evaluations and IEPs conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Indicator 12 collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation and IEP by the 3rd birthday had a completed evaluation and a subsequent eligibility determination made.

The State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation and IEP even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2020 within one year. The Early Childhood Coordinator worked directly with the LEA 619 coordinators or special education supervisor in the identified LEAs with technical assistance to ensure correction.

The LDOE does not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification is data-driven. LDOE runs a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2020, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance was corrected from FFY 2019. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Indicator 12 collection data collected through the state's special education reporting (SER) data system;
- Verified correction from prior year's noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Part C Transition report; and
- A review of evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all local education agencies (LEAs) as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which is disseminated via the LDOE data systems File Transfer Portal (FTP), LEAs with noncompliance submitted an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE Early Childhood Coordinator. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation and IEP were not implemented by the 3rd birthday, the number of days past due, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible.

In any instance whereby an LEA is found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Early Childhood Coordinator via the FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEAs' Plan of Action to determine if the LEA has revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. Per OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Indicator 12 collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs have corrected their noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2019 was reflected in the Indicator 12 collection data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- has completed the evaluation and IEP, although late for any child whose initial evaluation and IEP were not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State sent noncompliance letters to the LEA listing each individual case. The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all evaluations and IEPs conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Indicator 12 collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation and IEP by the 3rd birthday had a subsequent eligibility determination made. The Early Childhood Coordinator worked directly with each LEA 619 coordinator and special education supervisor to provide direct support and ensure individual noncompliance correction.

The State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation and IEP even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2019 within one year.

The LDOE does not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification is data-driven. LDOE runs a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2019, the LDOE took the following steps to ensure previously identified noncompliance from FFY 2018 was corrected. The LDOE conducted:

- A review of Indicator 12 collection data collected through the state's special education reporting (SER) data system;
- Verification of correction from prior year's noncompliance identified through a data analysis of the Part C Transition report; and
- A review of evaluation timelines for all school systems monitored through a self-assessment, desk reviews and on-site monitoring for the regular IDEA state monitoring procedures.

The LDOE conducted outreach to all local education agencies (LEAs) as part of these requirements and procedures with student-specific information relative to noncompliance and compliance updates. After receipt of this information, which is disseminated via the LDOE data systems File Transfer Portal (FTP), LEAs submitted an official Plan of Correction, sometimes referred to as a corrective action plan to the LDOE Early Childhood Coordinator. For the purposes of SPP/APR, the words are used synonymously. The plan included the student whose evaluation and IEP were not implemented by the 3rd birthday, the number of days past due, the reason the timeline was not met, how it could have been prevented, how the noncompliance was corrected and the personnel responsible.

In any instance whereby an LEA is found to be discrepant, the LDOE required the LEA to revise its current policies, practices and procedures that contributed to and resulted in noncompliance. Within the 30-day timeline LEAs' updated procedures were submitted to the Early Childhood Coordinator via the FTP. The LDOE staff reviewed the LEAs' Plan of Action to determine if the LEA revised their policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance and/or correct implementation of 34 CFR 300.301. Per OSEP QA 23-01, the State reviewed Indicator 12 collection data in SER to ensure all LEAs have corrected their noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2018 was reflected in the Indicator 12 collection data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301 based on the state review of collection data and
- has completed the evaluation and IEP, although late for any child whose initial evaluation and IEP were not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or program.

The State sent noncompliance letters to the LEA listing each individual case. The State required that each LEA submit evidence of all evaluations and IEPs conducted and completed within their jurisdiction. The State reviewed the Indicator 12 collection data related to this indicator to confirm that each student for whom an LEA did not complete their initial evaluation and IEP by the 3rd birthday had a subsequent eligibility determination made. The Early Childhood Coordinator worked directly with each LEA with individual noncompliance to ensure correction and provide technical assistance.

In the 2019 school year, the State confirmed that the students received their required evaluation and IEP even though late, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2018 within one year.

The LDOE does not rely exclusively on monitoring results to substantiate correction. Our primary source of verification is data-driven. LDOE runs a statewide sample of all school systems following the prior year's APR reporting period, paying close attention to the LEAs with prior year noncompliance and reporting on their current standing in the current APR.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator in the FFY 2022 APP/APR. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 22 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, remaining 33 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, FFY 2019, and FFY 2018: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 12 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline) of receiving parental consent for the evaluation.

The State reported 188 findings of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, however, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State reported 31 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and verified as corrected within one year with no findings remaining.

OSEP's Required Actions to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission required the State to make available the attachment not posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter. The State has not publicly posted the "Louisiana FFY 2021 Indicator 12 Reason for Non-Compliance and Range of Days" included in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission.

12 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline) of receiving parental consent for the evaluation, as required by the Measurement Table.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 188 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, 22 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, 33 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFYs 2021, 2020, 2019, and 2018: (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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

The State did not, as required by the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR, publicly post the "Louisiana FFY 2021 Indicator 12 Reason for Non-Compliance and Range of Days". In its FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must provide the link to the required information.

The State submitted verification that the Indicator 12 attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, the Indicator 12 attachment included in the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission is not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	53.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.38%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
487	620	98.38%	100%	78.55%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There are a number of factors that go into the slippage reported as a result of the data collected. Teacher shortage and vacancies, lack of documentation, data sharing challenges, changes to the State procedures used to evaluate compliance, increase in the number of files reviewed & overall systems monitored and lack of capacity to provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance on transition planning, development, and implementation of plans. The LDOE will continue to support school districts facing issues with non-compliance in transition planning. Efforts to provide technical assistance and professional development across the state will ensure that school districts will be better prepared to meet the requirements set forth in this indicator.

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.

Transition planning is the process, which helps students with an IEP, prepare for success in postsecondary education and employment. Louisiana has revised its method for analyzing and reporting Transition outcomes. For this indicator, Louisiana collects the results of transition monitoring from on-sites, desk audits and self-assessments monitoring. 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: 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 annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. Further, the State reviewed records to determine if the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were being 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 had 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 established state-mandated criteria. LEAs use the state-mandated process to identify records to review. LEAs followed the state-developed protocol to determine if the selected transition plan in the students’ current IEP met all the required components. The components include the following: measurable postsecondary goals that cover education/training, employment and as needed, independent living; annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable students to meet their postsecondary goal(s); evidence that representatives of external agencies were invited to attend IEP meetings; and courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of students to facilitate their movement from school to post-secondary education and employment.

During the FFY 2022, LDOE staff reviewed 620 records of youth aged 16 and above for compliance. Of that 620, there were 133 instances of noncompliance. Noncompliance for transition is identified when an IEP record reveals a violation in 1 of the 9 required transition components. This does not denote a systemic issue of statewide noncompliance, but are rather isolated instances of noncompliance.

For example, when an LDOE monitor marks noncompliance on the monitoring protocol for Transition services, the LEA receives a monitoring report that reveals each student-specific area of noncompliance for Transition. After an LEA has been notified of noncompliance, they are required to correct each individual finding within 30 business days. During this FFY 2022 reporting period, there were 133 individual Transition IEP files noncompliant across the 620 IEPs reviewed. This process for analyzing and reporting on this indicator slightly differs from the procedures and reporting for Indicator 13 during the last SPP/APR submissions.

The State did not meet its target of 100% and is currently at 78.55%. A detailed explanation for slippage has been included above. A transition based professional development program for Special Education Directors and Transition Coordinators is underway to ensure LEA Transition leaders are abreast of how to develop and implement compliant Transition Programs.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	15

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The LDOE conducted a verification to ensure that LEAs identified as having noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The LDOE enhanced special education reporting system (eSER) database was accessed to view each LEA’s report to determine compliance during periodic intervals throughout the year following the findings of noncompliance. The LDOE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance reflected in the data reported for this indicator are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data. All reviews of updated data were conducted within one year from the notification of noncompliance and were verified as corrected within one year. All noncompliance with Indicator 13 for FFY 2021 was corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. The indicator 13 manager contacted all special education supervisors within each LEA to discuss regulatory requirements and provide technical assistance.

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

For noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, the LDOE has verified that all LEAs have corrected each individual case of noncompliance based on a review of updated data about the transition components of the IEPs previously found out of compliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. The indicator 13 manager notified each LEA found with individual noncompliance, including each student-specific case, and required correction of the IEP along with evidence required to be submitted. The indicator 13 manager worked directly with the special education supervisor in each LEA to provide technical assistance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target >=	37.00%	39.00%	39.00%	34.00%	35.00%
A	25.30%	Data	39.33%	39.68%	34.79%	32.30%	33.00%
B	2009	Target >=	82.00%	84.00%	84.00%	74.00%	74.50%
B	55.30%	Data	76.93%	79.32%	65.93%	66.05%	65.66%
C	2009	Target >=	94.00%	96.00%	96.00%	90.00%	90.50%
C	73.60%	Data	88.30%	89.78%	88.82%	87.86%	88.81%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%
Target B >=	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%
Target C >=	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	5,877
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,072
Response Rate	52.27%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	998
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	949
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)	1,125
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).	0

Measure	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	998	3,072	33.00%	36.00%	32.49%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,947	3,072	65.66%	75.00%	63.38%	Did not meet target	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)	3,072	3,072	88.81%	91.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Data analysis from last year to this year indicates that while a slight increase was reported in enrollment in higher ed, but the number competitively employed decreased slightly and the number in other training or employment more than doubled from last year. These changes impacted the slippage and is the result of both challenges with getting additional responses and a need for more targeted postsecondary transition support for our students with disabilities. Louisiana recently received a national DIF grant that is targeting this work and these outcomes specifically.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	57.46%	52.27%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2022 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.

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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Louisiana uses a census method to collect data; the State does not sample. School systems disseminated the survey to post-school youth, and results were captured in the State’s Special Education Reporting (SER) data system. In FFY 2022, 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 2022 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.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State's Post School Transition survey is provided to school systems. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth using their preferred method, and results are collected in the State's SER system. To increase the response rate year over year, the LDOE will also provide school systems with a QR code for the survey to disseminate to youth who are no longer in high school. Youth who are no longer in school can use the QR code to complete the survey on a mobile device. The SER system is also being enhanced to collect more contact information, such as an email address, to better reach youth who are no longer in school.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

To ensure minimal nonresponse bias, Louisiana surveys all exiting students. The response rate was 52.27 percent with 3,072 respondents out of 5,877. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2021 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. School systems employed a variety of efforts to reach students and families. School system staff reached out to community agencies for current contact information when needed; they describe using multiple attempts using all phone numbers on record to contact each family, calling at different days and different times.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Louisiana's Post School Transition survey is available in the State's Students with Disabilities library.

Post School Transition: https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/post-school-transition-survey.pdf?sfvrsn=17909b1f_4

Students with Disabilities library: <https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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, 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 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. In addition, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

In its description of its FFY 2022 data, the State did not address 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, the State reported, "The LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2022 public IDEA student count."

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to include in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented; an analysis of the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response; and whether the FFY 2022 data are representative, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address the issue. The State provided none of the required information.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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, 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 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.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	34
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	22

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

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	60.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	50.00%	28.57%	35.29%	58.82%	40.91%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
22	34	40.91%	75.00%	64.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	13
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6

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

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability; the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
- Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	81.80%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
Data	50.00%	70.59%	72.73%	45.45%	60.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2	6	13	60.00%	82.00%	61.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Louisiana’s SiMR focuses on improving student-centered outcomes. Louisiana Believes starts with the premise that all children can achieve high expectations and should be prepared for college or career. The challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners begin early. When Louisiana improved the LEAP assessment, the gap between students with disabilities and their general education peers was shown to be larger than previously understood. For these reasons, Louisiana is focusing on literacy, a foundational skill necessary for success in all subjects and grades. Louisiana’s SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in eight school systems (SSIP cohort) across the state.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The SSIP cohort remains the same and includes 30 elementary/middle schools in 8 LEAs and specifically looks at the performance of students with disabilities in the cohort. Students in the cohort will change each year with incoming students into 3rd grade and as students move out of 5th grade.

Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Louisiana’s theory of action states that if (a) data-informed decision making, (b) evidence-based literacy practices and (c) continuous leadership development are implemented with fidelity then (a) districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, (b) educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, and (c) districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades.

Louisiana’s theory of action can also be accessed on page 6 here: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=70a66518_2.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	34.03%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	31.50%	32.50%	33.50%	34.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Scored Proficient in ELA	Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Took ELA 3-5 Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
128	544	26.47%	31.50%	23.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As a state 3rd graders grew 5% in mastery and 4th graders grew 4% in mastery. While statewide data showed improvement in grades 3-5 ELA assessment results, fluctuation in the cohort numbers can impact our data even slightly, and Louisiana is still addressing learning recovery across the state. 4th grade students with disabilities did not see growth as noted in indicator 3, and 4th grade is also included in our SiMR. Grade 3-5 ELA continues to be an area Louisiana will address since those students saw impacts from the pandemic in critical years (K-1) for learning to read. Evidence-based practices and structures of support are expected to impact this data positively in the future.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

LEAP 2025 statewide assessments for grades 3-5

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Louisiana collected statewide assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities using our secure testing portal and data system. Specifically for the SiMR, Louisiana pulls and analyzes students with disabilities performance on the ELA assessment in grades 3-5 in the cohort schools.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Literacy data continues to reveal improvement in performance among first, second and third graders over their prior year performance. Students' scores at each grade level on the literacy screener are reported as either "On or Above Benchmark" or "Below Benchmark." Students who scored "Below Benchmark" are considered "at risk" for reading difficulties according to authors of the assessments. Spring 2023 results revealed that 54.5 percent of third graders scored "On or Above Benchmark" for the measured skills. This growth also showed in the 3rd grade LEAP ELA scores across the state. 43 percent of third graders scored at Mastery and above in the 2023 Spring assessment, which was a 5 percent increase from the previous year.

The School Improvement Division, which provides school improvement support to 55 school systems, conducted 357 observations across Louisiana in K-12 schools in 2022-2023 using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool, 3-12 Classroom Support Tool, Instructional Leadership Team Support Tool, and Teacher Collaboration Support Tool. The School Improvement Team supported 7 of the SSIP cohort schools in School Improvement Best practices, which includes providing observation and feedback to improve professional learning structures, data driven systems, and classroom instruction. In these 7 cohort schools, School Improvement Support Specialists conducted 24 paired observations with system and school leaders that included classroom instruction, common planning time, and instructional leadership team meetings.

The data shows that as a state we continue to make gains in literacy and reading shown on these multiple measures, and Louisiana will continue to focus on intentional structures and initiatives that drive capacity of educators and student growth.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Louisiana remains committed to the theory of action, logic model and evaluation as interconnected components of the SSIP. In Phase III, the outcomes and data continue to drive our evidence-based literacy practices as well as continued professional development. Our evaluation plan is the same on pages 30-31 of the SSIP at this link: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf>.

Louisiana's LEAs also had to submit their Louisiana Comeback plans for 2022-2023, which outline their plans for increasing outcomes and recovering learning loss post-pandemic, including supports and outcomes for students with disabilities. Those LDOE approved plans are linked annually for every school system at louisianacomeback.com. Similarly, as part of our ongoing commitment to promoting effective literacy instruction for our youngest learners and supporting student achievement, LEAs now submit literacy plans for elementary schools across the state and will do so triennially moving forward.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Comeback Plans: From catastrophic hurricanes to a global pandemic, Louisiana has faced extraordinary obstacles over the past few years. To ensure our state and our LEAs have intentional strategic plans, the Department required LEAs to submit Comeback Plans again in 2022-2023. All LEA plans

can be found at louisianacomeback.com, which provides families and communities transparent access. For 2023-2024, LEAs also had to submit literacy plans for elementary schools across the state.

ELA Grades 3-12 Updated Curriculum/Educator Development: The LDOE supported systems in implementing the updated ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) units. Additionally, the LDOE worked with a group of educators to develop the new ELA Guidebooks 6-8 (2024) curriculum and began offering professional learning on the new units to educators across Louisiana. These units, along with an additional unit offering for each grade level for grades 3-5, will be released spring 2024 and additional professional learning will be offered to support implementation. Additional information for the new units can be found at this link: [https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academic-curriculum/ela-guidebooks-6-8-\(2024\)-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=26866018_14](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academic-curriculum/ela-guidebooks-6-8-(2024)-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=26866018_14).

To support all students in strengthening their writing skills, the mentor sentence and vocabulary activities for ELA Guidebooks 9-12 (2020) have been updated. These new activities include additional supports to ensure all learners are supported in completing the task.

In addition, in Fall 2022, the ELA content leader professional development modules for grades 3-5 were updated and released to reflect the revisions that were made to ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022). The modules were revised to assist educators in gaining the knowledge, content expertise, and skills to successfully instruct and leverage the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum. By the end of the modules, participants will be able to do the following: understand the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum, its content pedagogy approach, and how to effectively use it, describe the knowledge and skills needed to read and write to the level expected of students, and identify how the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) unit lessons build the knowledge and skills needed for students to be successful on the unit assessments, which measure the grade-level standards.

Literacy Coach Expansion: In 2022-2023, Louisiana entered its second year of implementing the Comprehensive Literacy Plan, which includes intentional literacy goals, key pillars and literacy best practices, and the Department began a Reading Revival Campaign. Louisiana has trained hundreds of literacy coaches across the state and in 2021-2022, LDOE added a requirement that Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) elementary schools employ a literacy coach. The Department continued to offer free, required Science of Reading professional development for all K-3 administrators and educators in our state, and added a K-2 literacy content leader track to our content leader cohorts. In 2022-2023, monthly communities of practice were offered to continue to build capacity of literacy coaches across the state. As a result of feedback from special educators, LDOE also offered foundational literacy professional development modules to middle school educators, targeting grades 4-8, special educators and interventionists.

Our annual Teacher Leader Summit in May 2023, a gathering of approximately 4,000 school system leaders, school leaders and teacher leaders, was a fully in-person event themed "Accelerate to Success." The event included more sessions geared toward supporting students with disabilities than ever before. Objectives of this annual event include improving the everyday practice of Louisiana leaders and educators, providing opportunities for collaboration and sharing best practices, introducing high-quality strategies, resources, and professional development and fostering an empowering, engaging and inspiring culture among educators. Sessions geared toward the objective of our SiMR include a series of grades 3-5 sessions on the new ELA Guidebook units "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Overview of Updates," "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Evaluation Plan Participant Guide," "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Evaluation Plan," and "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Using Core and Optional Activities." Additional sessions included "Accelerate ELA," "Building Knowledge in ELA Units," "Science of Reading," "Using IEPs to Support Daily Instruction" and many more.

The School Improvement Team continued to support many LEAs in 2022-2023 in the School Improvement Best Practice strategy of providing targeted, differentiated support to school systems by supporting and coaching system and school leaders on Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Collaboration. The Division of School Improvement supports the Department's priority to cultivate high-impact systems, structures and partnerships by providing differentiated and targeted school improvement support to system leaders in the implementation of the Department's School Improvement Best Practices in schools identified as Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) and Urgent Intervention Required - Academics (UIR-A). This work focuses on the sustainability of school improvement by providing system leaders with the tools and knowledge to ensure both the implementation and continual improvement of best practices at the school level through high-quality coaching and feedback. During 2022-2023, the division signed agreements with 55 systems to support 196 selected schools in the implementation of Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Support and/or Teacher Collaboration (TC) Support. School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) consulted with system leaders to determine needs and set goals for each targeted site. These SISS conducted 357 paired observations with system leaders of ILT meetings, TC meetings, and K-12 classroom instruction and coached these system leaders to deliver high-quality feedback to school leaders. Progress at each system/school was monitored using walkthrough tools specific to the best practice observed and the resulting data was used to inform subsequent coaching visits. 61% of Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) Schools receiving Best Practice Support increased students scoring Mastery and above. In addition, 67% of supported schools increased their School Performance Score, with 40% increasing by at least 3 points. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2023-2024 school year.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Louisiana continues to carry out a multi-layered approach to driving improved student outcomes for students with disabilities. The Louisiana Comeback plans required by each LEA, which required LDOE approval, allowed LDOE to ensure high-yield strategies were being implemented across the state to address attendance and well-being, learning acceleration and recovery, and professional learning. The Super App school planning process is still utilized and is aligned to the state's priorities, allowing spending to also be directed toward Louisiana priorities. The planning process continues to allow school systems to use data in planning, budgeting and implementation in alignment with key priorities. This operating cycle continues each year. This level of state and local governance and planning led to improved outcomes, learning recovery and our growth in literacy and in ELA mastery for the second year in a row post pandemic.

The Department relocated the Office of Special Education into Office of Teaching and Learning: In January 2022, the Department intentionally placed the Office of Special Education within the Office of Teaching and Learning. Immediately, the Department modeled the collaboration required in LEAs to improve outcomes for all students, a model that brings academic content, literacy, school improvement and special educators together. The decision places students with disabilities at the center of our teaching and learning strategy in Louisiana. This structural model is bringing general education and special education together more intentionally across our state.

Louisiana is also committed in its structures to embed supports for students with disabilities and ownership of outcomes across all offices in the Department. Specifically related to our SiMR, the Department has continued work to embed supports for diverse learners in its ELA Guidebook

curriculum, ensuring quality standards, with feedback and development from Louisiana educators. This work resulted in increased achievement across the board for the second year in a row on statewide assessments; 3rd graders showed the highest gains in ELA in years growing 5% and 4th graders grew 6% in ELA. This indicates the focus on high quality curriculum combined with intentional literacy support in these grades are resulting in statewide improvement. Our students with disabilities across the state grew in proficiency for the second year in a row post pandemic.

Our educator development structures include Content Leader and Teacher Leader initiatives that impact LEAs and sustainability by developing cadres of talented teacher leaders each year who develop the knowledge and skills to lead and coach other teachers in their LEAs and schools. The School Improvement Team also conducts similar technical assistance and support in some of our most struggling schools throughout the state intended to provide LEA and school leaders with curriculum implementation and educator development knowledge and skills that allow them to scale that support throughout their schools. Our SPED Fellow Academy, which launched cohort three in 2022-2023, is a year-long, comprehensive development program for novice special education leaders across the state. The fellowship provides in-person training, coaching, and a community of practice that will instill the knowledge and skills the next generation of leaders need to lead and sustain change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Louisiana's intense literacy strategy and increase in professional development and literacy coaches across Louisiana is allowing for literacy and reading recovery in our elementary grades demonstrated by our fall reading report and continued improvement.

Literacy Field Employees: The Literacy Team hired several field employees to provide regional literacy training and technical assistance and to provide technical support to literacy coaches that are now required in elementary schools across Louisiana.

Monitoring and technical assistance efforts of the School Improvement Team led to 75% of LEAs improving their system performance scores in 2022-2023.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Louisiana uses a multi-layered approach to implementing specific structures and best practices intended to increase outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities. Louisiana Comeback Plans will ensure intentional strategic planning and alignment of funds to improve priority areas for LEAs. Guidance from the SEA throughout the year supports this success. Additional next steps around these plans include specific assurances and requirements for the 25% of school systems who did not show growth. For example, requiring specific coaching and directed funding including strategic planning support with the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent and ensuring expectations for literacy and mathematics.

Educator Development: The Department recognizes the critical role that school leadership teams serve in supporting educators in making data informed decisions and in supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices. The Department will release a Professional Learning Roadmap and will reinstate LDOE facilitated School Support Institutes to provide additional training to school system instructional leadership teams (ILT) in synthesizing data and supporting educators in the implementation of high-quality curriculum. The expanded Content Leader initiatives will work together with the School Support Institutes to develop leaders at multiple levels of the school system who can enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five and even earlier with the K-2 Literacy Content Leader structure. Continuous leadership development improves teaching and facilitates and promotes lifelong learning. While our Content Leader and Teacher Leader structures will continue, Louisiana is launching supports for new educators entering the field and will include a specific affinity group for new special educators entering the field. The intent will be to support new special educators entering the field, to support them in their craft and to retain them for years to come.

Literacy Field Employees: The literacy team will continue to provide "road shows," and support in LEAs with writing literacy goals, monitoring progress and implementing high quality foundational literacy programs. These field staff will also serve to support the many literacy coaches across the state, which will lead to better literacy outcomes for children with disabilities. The special education team will also begin work alongside the literacy team to support children with dyslexia in our state. Next steps also include dyslexia-specific support and training cohorts as well as increased support with supporting students with disabilities toward literacy improvements.

School Improvement Team Efforts: The School Improvement Team will continue to provide differentiated support on best school improvement practices in LEAs across the state. Planning will also begin around supporting schools who persistently struggle, including more targeted intervention and support.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports
Literacy support
Accelerating Learning and High Quality Intervention
High Quality Summer Learning Programs
Leading Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports:
Louisiana continues to intentionally expand efforts and embed diverse learner supports within high quality instructional materials. Louisiana's ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum helps all students read, understand, and express their understanding of complex, grade-level texts, build students' understanding and knowledge through text sets, compelling questions, and integrated reading and writing activities. Louisiana released new ELA Guidebooks grades 3-5 units in May 2022 and began training at the Teacher Leader Summit and continued that training in 2022-2023. ELA Content Leaders across the state were provided updated training to deploy the updated curriculum across the state in every LEA. Materials were also provided to support students with significant cognitive disabilities to access this high quality curriculum.

Louisiana's Literacy Team continue to support literacy across the state providing support on writing literacy goals, developing and releasing literacy interventions, supporting professional development and creating family literacy resources. Louisiana now has over 300 trained literacy coaches and 16 regional literacy specialists across the state in elementary schools. Resources for K-3 literacy support such as sound wall resources, phonological awareness cards, and dyslexia resources were released. The Literacy Intervention and Foundational Toolkit (LIFT) kit for grades 2 and up and the Foundational Instruction for Reading Excellence (FIRE) kit for grades 3-5 were released. Regional road shows were provided. In 2022-2023, LDOE launched science of reading modules for educators, special educators and interventionists in grades 4-8 to expand professional development beyond the grades K-3 required in the state by legislation.

Accelerate is Louisiana's Pre-K-12 Tutoring Strategy, designed for school systems to implement equal access tutoring at-scale in order to achieve significant results for all students. Grounded in the most impactful research-based practices, Accelerate is a just-in-time, pre-teaching model that addresses unfinished learning by building knowledge and connecting it to skills in current lessons. In 2021-2022, an Accelerate Pilot was launched that required pilot participants to implement the Accelerate tutoring strategy and accompanying materials in their schools. Pre-K-12 ELA and math tutoring materials were updated in 2021-2022 and continue to be used in tutoring, intervention and summer learning programs in many schools. In 2021-2022 the Department released Staffing and Scheduling Guidance (attached), with specific supports for students with disabilities, to ensure equal access to intervention and schedules that provide students with the extra time needed to recover learning. CIR and UIR labeled schools were required to implement accelerate during the school year and during required summer learning programs.

Summer Learning Guidance was expanded in 2022 and the most struggling schools in Louisiana were issued a requirement to provide summer learning to students. The guidance focused on structures and elements of a summer program, resources for implementing elements, staffing and scheduling considerations, sample schedules, checklists for action steps and funding information. Guidance also included the new recommendation that 5 weeks of summer learning be provided for students who struggle. Webinars were provided to LEAs to implement high quality summer learning programs and LDOE recommended that students with disabilities also participate in these opportunities. Family summer learning guidance was also released in a Family Summer Learning Toolkit, with specific recommendations for families of students with disabilities.

Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance: School systems often face unique and complex challenges in improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Addressing these challenges is multifaceted and requires leaders who can effectively coordinate programming within and across departments and schools to increase access to inclusive learning opportunities for students with disabilities. In January 2022, the Department began releasing a series of guidance materials for Leading Inclusive Special Education Programs (sample attached). Each guidance document covers a critical topic for special education programming. Following the release of each guidance document, a webinar is available to school systems to support implementation. School system leaders are encouraged to review the guidance materials and attend webinars in partnership with special education leaders. Additionally, in 2022-2023 LDOE released the Special Education Playbook for System Leaders that adopts three best inclusive instructional practices: 1) ensuring access to inclusive, core general education, 2) providing extra time to learn, and 3) ensuring content strong educators are providing core instruction and content intervention support.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Each of the evidence-based practices are aimed at providing comprehensive support for educators in all grades, but specifically ELA educators in grades 3-5. Our 3-5 ELA Guidebook updates will strengthen and embed diverse learner supports and intentional writing supports into the curriculum which will directly impact their achievement on aligned statewide assessments used to measure the SiMR. Strategic literacy best practices will continue to be refined and implemented to support literacy development such that students in grades 3-5 will be on grade-level and increase outcomes in ELA; we must start in the foundational years to impact this outcome. Our tutoring and intervention strategies will provide students with disabilities the extra time they need in an equitable way to increase outcomes; the support for educators around these strategies ensure they have the capacity to implement data-driven interventions for students. The Summer Learning Guidance will help LEAs plan and implement effective, accessible summer learning, especially targeting Mathematics and ELA instruction, aimed at addressing accelerating learning for all students following the pandemic. This layered approach to implement SSIP strategies is intended to increase student achievement.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Data from the latest NAEP results indicated that Louisiana is showing reading growth, especially in 4th grade. While many states fell in ranking across the board, Louisiana moved up in overall ranking; in 2019 Louisiana ranked 46th and in 2022 Louisiana ranked 42nd. Also in 2022, Louisiana was #1 in the nation for 4th grade reading growth; Louisiana grew in scale scores while the national overall declined in 4th grade reading. These results are tied directly to our SiMR which encompasses grades 3-5 ELA performance, and Louisiana believes our priority to safely return students to in-person learning as quickly as possible post-pandemic, our statewide learning acceleration initiative, and our statewide literacy initiatives led to these results. Additionally, state LEAP ELA assessment results are collected and analyzed, which also show another year of gains in ELA in these grades.

Literacy data continues to reveal improvement in performance among first, second and third graders over their prior year performance. Students' scores at each grade level on the literacy screener are reported as either "On or Above Benchmark" or "Below Benchmark." Students who scored "Below Benchmark" are considered "at risk" for reading difficulties according to authors of the assessments. Spring 2023 results revealed that 54.5 percent of third graders scored "On or Above Benchmark" for the measured skills. This growth also showed in the 3rd grade LEAP ELA scores across the state. 43 percent of third graders scored at Mastery and above in the 2023 Spring assessment, which was a 5 percent increase from the previous year.

During 2022-2023, the School Improvement Division signed agreements with 55 systems to support 196 selected schools in the implementation of Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Support and/or Teacher Collaboration (TC) Support. School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) consulted with system leaders to determine needs and set goals for each targeted site. These SISS conducted 357 paired observations with system leaders of ILT meetings, TC meetings, and K-12 classroom instruction and coached these system leaders to deliver high-quality feedback to school leaders. Progress at each system/school was monitored using walkthrough tools specific to the best practice observed and the resulting data was used to inform subsequent coaching visits. 61% of Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) Schools receiving Best Practice Support increased students scoring Mastery and above. In addition, 67% of supported schools increased their School Performance Score, with 40% increasing by at least 3 points. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2023-2024 school year.

Louisiana's indicator 5 data also indicates that the majority of our students with disabilities are in inclusive settings receiving high quality content instruction, which impacts students' ability to master grade level content expected on the state LEAP assessments.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

NAEP reading results, our fall literacy data, and the School Improvement observational data are all used to provide additional progress monitoring.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports: 3-5 ELA Guidebooks implementation support will continue and included additional professional development sessions at Teacher Leader Summit 2023. Next steps include additional supports and updates to 6-8 ELA Guidebooks. Additionally, LDOE will launch a pilot with LEAs for full implementation of the special education best practices outlined in the Playbook.

Literacy support: Continued professional development around the science of reading will continue and literacy support for students with disabilities. Dyslexia training cohorts will be a next step. Louisiana is also deploying a statewide literacy screener in 2023-2024, which will improve the quality of literacy data.

Accelerating Learning and High Quality Intervention: Following the Accelerate Pilot, much more emphasis will be placed on high quality intervention that accelerates learning for students with disabilities. LDOE will continue to require an accelerate approach to learning for our most struggling schools and during required summer learning programs.

High Quality Summer Learning Programs: Updated guidance on summer programs will include a specific recommendation of at least 5 weeks of programming. This will provide supports for our students with disabilities and help to further accelerate learning and help close achievement gaps.

Leading Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance: Additional inclusive education guidance documents will be released based on feedback from special education advisors and leaders across our state and based on feedback from LEA leaders and educators. Interested pilot participants will be gathered in 2023-2024 for implementation of special education best practices.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

While Louisiana will continue the implementation of the strategies outlined, the SEA does intend to engage stakeholders to reassess the SiMR cohort model and its support of all students with disabilities in Louisiana.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

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. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability;t the committee analyzes the diversity of the panel and regions of the state represented.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2022.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members, including a diverse group of parents, who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents of individuals with disabilities. In FFY 2022 SEAP was updated with progress. SEAP also had valuable impact to update state policy, assessment feedback and literacy supports for students with disabilities during the reporting year.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. 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. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2022.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups, all including diverse groups of parents as well, were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission
- Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission

Teacher Leader Advisors
Families Helping Families
Exceptional Lives Louisiana
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors
Monitoring Stakeholder Group

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators including direction on state priorities and IDEA state set aside funding priorities.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Throughout 2022-2023 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
Related Services Advisory Commission (new commission)
Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
Early Literacy Commission
Teacher Leader Advisors
Families Helping Families
Exceptional Lives Louisiana
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
Governor's Office of Disability Affairs
Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors

As part of our literacy commission, an additional task force was added to directly address literacy for students with disabilities.

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholder feedback and input is valued at all levels of engagement. Concerns expressed during 2022-2023 related to the SiMR were primarily focused on ensuring high quality literacy instruction for all students, including students with disabilities and students with significant cognitive disabilities.

In response, additional literacy guidance has been released and a focus that includes not "if" a student with a disability should be screened for literacy skills but rather "how" ensuring all students with disabilities and their families have information on the student's current literacy skills. Additional literacy intervention materials were released, family resources to support literacy and adding state requirements for literacy intervention plans for all students scoring below level. In 2022-2023, LDOE also provided a Family Summer Support Toolkit to prepare families for the current school year with summer learning support activities, including a section specifically for parents of students with disabilities.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

All activities have been included.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Louisiana believes that if (a) data-informed decision making, (b) evidence-based literacy practices and (c) continuous leadership development are implemented with fidelity then (a) districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, (b) educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, and (c) districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 3-5. Louisiana's theory of action can also be accessed on page 6 here: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=70a66518_2.

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/assessment/2023-2024-assessment-calendar.pdf>

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

As Louisiana identifies barriers, stakeholders are consulted and solutions are put into place. For example, the state Special Education Advisory Panel is continuing to impact literacy efforts and provide recommendations to support students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

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:

Meredith Jordan

Title:

State Director Special Education

Email:

meredith.jordan@la.gov

Phone:

2254855228

Submitted on:

04/25/24 8:41:48 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Louisiana 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
62.50%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	12	60.00%
Compliance	20	13	65.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	22%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	85%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	32%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	83%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	99%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	32%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	87%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	13%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	84%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	21	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	60	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	98.65%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	98.82%	NO	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	78.55%	YES	1
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	93.32%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	44.00%		0
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Louisiana

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	0	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	20
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	25

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	0	2
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	0	1	2

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	25
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	48.52
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9332
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.32

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	<i>EDFacts</i> Files/ <i>EMAPS</i> Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Louisiana

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	93
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	25
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	6
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	11
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	6
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	2
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	62

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	23
(2.1) Mediations held.	13
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	4
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	2
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	9
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	6
(2.2) Mediations pending.	3
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	7

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	40
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	34
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	22
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	2
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	12
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	26

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	12
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	12
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	9
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	1
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	1
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	2
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	9

State Comments:

Many LEAs were still implementing virtual or hybrid schedules for a portion of the 2020-2021 school year. However, as anticipated, the State saw an increase in complaints with the return of in-person learning for all LEAs. Furthermore, the increases from year to year is the result of families increasing awareness of the StateNULLs dispute resolution options.

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Louisiana

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Cade Brumley
State Superintendent
Louisiana Department of Education
1201 North 3rd Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Dear Superintendent Brumley:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Louisiana needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Louisiana's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Louisiana's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Louisiana).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP used results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Louisiana's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Louisiana-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Louisiana's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Louisiana is required to take. The actions that Louisiana is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Louisiana's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Louisiana's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Louisiana's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Louisiana's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Louisiana's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Louisiana of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\) | OSEP Ideas That Work, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Louisiana to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Louisiana should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Louisiana 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. We strongly encourage Louisiana to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Louisiana must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Louisiana received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Louisiana took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Louisiana must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Louisiana must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Louisiana on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Louisiana's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Louisiana must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Louisiana must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA’s website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Louisiana’s determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Louisiana’s efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Louisiana over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Louisiana Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.