

Louisiana State Performance Plan – Part B

July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2012

Under the
Individuals with Disabilities
Educational Improvement Act of 2004

John White
State Superintendent of Education

Revised February 15, 2013



State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mr. Chas Roemer*President*6th BESE District**Mr. James D. Garvey, Jr.***Vice President*1st BESE District**Ms. Kira Orange Jones**2nd BESE District**Ms. Lottie Beebe**3rd BESE District**Mr. Walter Lee**4th BESE District**Mr. Jay Guillot**5th BESE District**Mr. Holly Boffy***Secretary/ Treasurer*7th BESE District**Ms. Carolyn Hill**8th BESE District**Ms. Judith Miranti**

Member-at-Large

Ms. Connie Bradford

Member-at-Large

Mr. Stephen Waguespack

Member-at-Large

Ms. Heather Cope

Executive Director

For further information, contact:
Bernell Cook, Division Director
Division of NCLB & IDEA Support
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
225-342-0202
Bernell.Cook@la.gov

The Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) does not discriminate on the basis of sex in any of the education programs or activities that it operates, including employment and admission related to such programs and activities. The LDOE is required by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX) and its implementing regulations not to engage in such discrimination. LDOE's Title IX Coord. is Patrick Weaver, Deputy Undersecretary, LDOE, Exec. Office of the Supt.; PO Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; 877-453-2721 or customerservice@la.gov. All inquiries pertaining to LDOE's policy prohibiting discrimination based on sex or to the requirements of Title IX and its implementing regulations can be directed to Patrick Weaver or to the USDE, Asst. Sec. for Civil Rights.

Web Only Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development.....	4
<u>FAPE IN THE LRE</u>	
Indicator 1: High School Diploma Rate.....	7
Indicator 2: Dropout Rate.....	13
Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment.....	19
Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion.....	31
Indicator 5: Placement of Students, Ages 6-21.....	36
Indicator 6: Placement of Students, Ages 3-5.....	45
Indicator 7: Performance, Ages 3-5.....	48
Indicator 8: Family Involvement.....	55
<u>DISPROPORTIONALITY</u>	
Indicator 9: Disproportionality, Overall Identification.....	63
Indicator 10: Disproportionality, Identification by Classifications.....	71
<u>GENERAL SUPERVISION</u>	
Indicator 11: Timely Evaluations.....	77
Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B.....	82
Indicator 13: Transition, Ages 16+.....	86
Indicator 14: Transition, Postsecondary Survey.....	89
Indicator 15: General Supervision.....	93
Indicator 16: Complaints.....	100
Indicator 17: Due Process.....	103
Indicator 18: Resolution Settlements.....	105
Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements.....	108
Indicator 20: Accurate Data.....	110
Attachment 1: Dispute Resolution Data	114

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Louisiana developed a time frame for compiling the *State Performance Plan* with as much opportunity for broad stakeholder input as possible before the required submission date. It was important for the Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance staff to have ample time to collect data components that would provide stakeholders with necessary background information to participate in the development of Louisiana's plan. Work groups were formed across Divisions within the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) in order to provide for needed collaboration in moving toward strategic planning for the improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities.

Long-range planning helpful in preparation for the State Performance Plan began with stakeholders' meetings in November and December 2004. An ad hoc committee met first to prepare for the larger group which was meeting in December to set priorities for the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Process (CIMP). This stakeholder group, the CIMP Steering Committee, is comprised of consumers, parents, family advocacy groups, university personnel, state service providers, local education agency administrators, state improvement grantees, and state education staff. Last year, this stakeholder group merged two stakeholder groups – one tasked with examining improvement activities, the other monitoring activities. At the December meeting with the entire group of stakeholders, state goals for improvement were identified and focused monitoring indicators were selected.

Bearing in mind the requirements of *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* legislation, Louisiana's Steering Committee projected performance targets through the year 2014 for the important areas of (1) Graduation with a Diploma, (2) Dropout Rate, (3) Placement, ages 6-21 and ages 3-5, (4) Achievement Performance Levels, and (5) Discipline. Annual gains were set in order to reach the ambitious 2014 goals. Further refinement of targets based upon the requirements and language of the SPP monitoring priorities and indicator areas was planned for a regularly scheduled Steering Committee Meeting in September.

Following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the evacuation of coastal regions in August and September, it became impossible to assemble the Steering Committee for their planned September meeting. Because there were no available overnight accommodations anywhere in the state, it was determined that gathering stakeholders' comments could best be achieved through electronic communication. The draft SPP was put on the Department of Education website for review and comment; stakeholder groups were notified through a memorandum that the public was being offered an opportunity to assist the LDOE in the development of the SPP.

Anticipating the requirement for public comment, LDOE began educating stakeholder groups about the development of the SPP and its reporting requirements as early as July 2005. At a statewide training in July 2005, the draft SPP monitoring priorities, indicator areas and performance targets were shared with Louisiana's regional parent center network, Families Helping Families (FHF). The FHF system of nine regionally located parent centers collaborate with Louisiana's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), Project PROMPT, to offer information and referral, education and training, and peer to peer support to students with disabilities and their families. This organization was enthusiastic about the collection and reporting of data pertaining to local education agencies and looked forward to the opportunity for public comment. Participants offered suggestions for handling data collection in determining parent and family satisfaction with educational services for children.

In October 2005, the SPP was presented to the Developmental Disabilities (DD) Council, an organization that represents agencies serving individuals with disabilities in Louisiana. During the presentation, agency representatives were encouraged to assist in the development of the SPP through email or at the Department website during November 2005.

Another venue for broad stakeholder input was a meeting of the Special Education Advisory Council. The Council works closely with Louisiana's Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE), a partially elected, partially appointed board which has the authority to make policy decisions that govern the public education system. The Council advises BESE on framing state policies, practices and procedures affecting special populations. There was an opportunity for the Advisory Council to review and comment on the SPP at a meeting in October and again in November 2005. In a BESE meeting prior to the submission of the SPP, there was an opportunity for the full Board to review and comment on the SPP, and in December BESE members approved the final version of Louisiana's State Performance Plan.

In formulating the SPP, consideration of education initiatives impacting all children was of paramount importance. The LDOE personnel worked across Divisions and collaborated to include programs normally regarded as regular education in the development of the plan. SPP work groups included representatives from several Divisions (Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards & Assessments; Family, Career & Technical Education; School & Community Support), thus creating the involvement and buy-in necessary to develop and implement a successful plan.

Problem-solving strategies were used by work groups which carefully considered the data reporting components of the SPP and looked for evidence of weakness or problems in Louisiana's programs. Improvement strategies were proposed which were felt to most impact successful outcomes for children; evaluation of the effectiveness of improvement efforts will be integral to future reporting.

The LDOE will establish an "SPP Oversight Committee" comprised of internal (across Divisions) and external (e.g., Institutions of Higher Education/IHEs, Local Education Agencies/LEAs, and family members of children with disabilities) personnel to coordinate the implementation of SPP activities across all indicators and ensure a coherent effort. This oversight committee will evaluate the process and activities to ensure expected outcomes. Subcommittees will be formed to address specific activities (e.g., demonstration sites). This oversight committee will meet at least quarterly and report to the Assistant Superintendent of Student Programs. The oversight committee will also ensure that the progress on State Performance Plan activities and outcomes are linked to the LDOE public relations campaign.

When the *State Performance Plan* is in its final form, Louisiana will initially disseminate it by having it immediately available online to download and print from the Louisiana Department of Education website, <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/academics/students-with-disabilities>; copies of the SPP will be mailed to any individual or agency upon request. The major news media in Louisiana will be provided copies of the SPP, along with information regarding its development and data reporting requirements.

LEAs are familiar with the use of Performance Profiles as reports on mandated data indicators. These district profiles comparing individual districts to statewide averages have been reported to the public since 1999-2000 and are currently on the Department website. Louisiana will change the template of its current profile to include the data indicators required by the February 1, 2007, *Annual Performance Report*.

Undoubtedly, data reported from the 2005-06 school year will show the effects of our highly mobile groups of hurricane evacuees who have dispersed to regions all around the state and country. One in four school-aged children in Louisiana is displaced because of the hurricanes and is now attending a different school than at the start of the school year. In many indicator areas of the SPP, the targets for the next several years have been set at levels taking the educational impact of the hurricanes into consideration. It is expected that the strategies for improvement will take some time to become established and effective as our student population stabilizes; short-term gains may be delayed, but it is anticipated that our projected six-year gains will be achieved.

The revision of the SPP submitted February 1, 2007, reflects the addition of baseline data and status data, targets and improvement activities for the new indicator areas 4B, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 18. In response to the change in the measurement requirement for Indicator 15, new baseline data for that Indicator have been included. For other SPP indicator areas, there are additions and changes to improvement activities in order to enhance the state's efforts to achieve its desired targets.

The Louisiana State Performance Plan, which was posted on the Department of Education website in February 2008, has revisions which reflect the latest instructions from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP): baseline data, targets, and improvement activities are added to Indicator 14, and progress data and improvement activities are added to Indicator 7. As instructed by OSEP, Louisiana has included no further reporting on Indicator 4B or Indicator 6 in either the 2008 Revision of the SPP or the 2008 APR. There are several minor changes to the SPP in the 2008 Revision, and all such changes are clearly noted and explained in the 2008 APR with boldly accented print. All changes reflect the fine-tuning of the state's plan in order to best meet the needs of students with disabilities and their families.

Broad Stakeholder input was solicited on April 2, 2013 to discuss improvement activities for the upcoming cycle of the Annual Performance Report. The following recommendations were made from the committee: incorporate quarterly update meetings for Directors/Supervisors of Special Education and to incorporate Parent Trainings through Families Helping Families organizations. All recommendations were considered and can be made available through various resources. The Department of Education will meet twice a year for stakeholder input.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

High school diploma rate for students with disabilities = Beginning in 2007, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) began calculating graduation data based on a cohort of students who entered the 9th grade for the first time in the State of Louisiana in a given academic year. Each cohort of students is tracked for four years, from entry as first-time ninth graders through four academic years. Students who graduate after the fourth year are counted as graduates. Students who graduate or complete high school in less than 4 years will be included in the cohort in which they started ninth grade.

Graduation with a diploma has historically been a problem for regular and special education students because of the rigorous high school graduation requirements in Louisiana. Students must pass regular education courses designed to prepare them for postsecondary education; also, they must pass exit examinations in order to graduate with a diploma. There is only one high school diploma offered in Louisiana. In order to earn a high school diploma, a student must pass 23 Carnegie Units (4 English, 3 Mathematics, 3 Science, 3 Social Studies, 1 ½ Physical Education, ½ Health and 8 Electives), as well as, three out of four components of the Graduation Exit Exam (GEE) – English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and/or Social Studies. English/Language Arts and Mathematics are taken in the spring of the tenth grade; Science and Social Studies are taken in the spring of the eleventh grade. Effective November 2005, students with disabilities are eligible for a waiver of one component of the GEE when documentation supports that it would be impacted by the student's disability.

All students have the opportunity to retest for all components of the GEE. Students may retake any failed component in the summer and fall, in addition to the regular spring testing session. Seniors have an additional opportunity in early February to retest any failed component. Any student who fails English/Language Arts and/or Mathematics will have a total of seven opportunities to retest prior to a graduation date at the end of the school year. Any student who fails Science and/or Social Studies will have a total of four opportunities to retest prior to a graduation date at the end of the school year.

General education and special education students who have not been successful in meeting the requirements for a high school diploma may choose to enter the Pre-GED/Skills Options Program. It is designed to provide students with academic preparation for the GED (General Education Diploma) and skills instruction to prepare for further post-secondary vocational training and/or entry in the work force. The Pre-GED/Skills Options Program also includes a work ethics component and a counseling component. The Pre-GED/Skills Options Program allows LEAs to create skill certificate programs that represent business and industry needs within their individual geographic locations.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): The percent of students with disabilities graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma for the 2004-2005 school year was 17.42%.

Exit Reason	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
No Longer Receives Special Ed.	1092	15.49%
High School Diploma	1228	17.42%
Certificate of Achievement	849	12.04%
Reached 22nd Birthday	205	2.91%
Death	54	0.77%
Moved, Known to be Continuing	1351	19.17%
Dropped Out	1852	26.27%
Locally Designed Skills Certificate	259	3.67%
Louisiana Equivalency Diploma (GED)	62	0.88%
GED and Locally Designed Skills Certificate	27	0.38%
Industry-Based Skills Certificate	21	0.30%
GED and Industry-Based Skills Certificate	4	0.06%
Certificate of Course Work/Activities Completion	45	0.64%
Total	7049	

Source: Special Education Public Counts from LANSER December 1, 2004 IDEA

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The graduation rate has declined from 2002-2003 (22.6%) to 2004-2005 (17.42%). A potential reason for decreased graduation rates could be that some students with disabilities are choosing the Pre-GED/Skills Options Program, which is considered a positive outcome, but which does not result in the receipt of Louisiana’s standard high school diploma. Other reasons for the decline in the graduation rate may be due to inadequate provision of accommodation/modifications to support students with disabilities in regular education settings; students may not be accessing the general education curriculum to the extent necessary to pass required Carnegie Unit classes. Other state data indicate a lack of certified personnel, which impacts the quality of classroom instruction. Additionally, the latest version of Louisiana’s high stakes Graduate Exit Exam has a different format than was used in previous years; GEE requires students to possess a different set of skills. Previous Exit Tests were entirely multiple-choice, except for one Writing Exam which involved constructing an essay. The new GEE testing format requires many written responses on all test sections, which is difficult for some students. Another reason for the low graduation rate may be attributed to our statewide alternate assessment instrument not being a high stakes test. Students with disabilities (SWD) who do not reach the grade level proficiency standard, may still be promoted to the next grade. SWDs are not required to attend summer remediation and may not receive timely interventions to progress in the general curriculum. IEP Teams need to be more diligent in calling IEP meetings when a student is not progressing early in the school year instead of waiting until after testing in the spring. Districts could strengthen their Pupil Progression Plans to discuss the need for more intervention when students are falling behind and not just socially promote to the next grade.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	18.00%

2006 (2006-2007)	18.00%
2007 (2007-2008)	19.00%
2008 (2008-2009)	25.00%
2009 (2009-2010)	34.00%
2010 (2010-2011)	40.67%
2011 (2011-2012)	50.00%
2012 (2012-2013)	61.00%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 1.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>The LDOE will disseminate current information on new initiatives and graduation pathways to Local Education Agencies, family information centers and related stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A Commission/workgroup appointed to address college and career readiness concerns will recommend actions to the state to address the needs of our students including academic remediation, dropout prevention, and high school diploma obtainment. ➤ The state will disseminate recommendations from the Commission to Local Education Agencies and related stakeholders throughout each academic year through the Department of Education’s website. <p>See Indicator 2 for related improvement activities</p>	2011- 2013	LDOE Governor’s Office Office of Content Louisiana’s Promise Education’s Next Horizon
Improvement Activity 1.2	Timelines	Resources
High School Redesign Commission and workgroups will recommend actions to assist the state in redesigning public	Completed	LDOE: Office of School &

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>high schools to address the academic needs of all students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold commission/work group meeting to update activities and develop recommendations for policy change • Hold statewide public meetings to disseminate information on recommendations • Bring recommendation to BESE • Implement <i>High School Counts</i> Campaign—a public outreach campaign from radio and television ads to disseminate information of the high school redesign agenda • Create a “P-16 Plus” database that uses unique student identifiers to track young people across K-12, higher education, and the workforce with information published in an annual report • Create a <i>High School Counts</i> website which will house annual reports and provide access to information at all levels of education. • The Louisiana Department of Education, the Board of Regents, and the Department of Labor will collaborate to identify and track at-risk students, with the ultimate goal of students’ reentry into school and vocational training to maximize their talents and work potential. 	<p>Oct. 2005</p> <p>Winter 2005</p> <p>Jan. 2006</p> <p>2008</p> <p>2008</p> <p>2008</p> <p>FFY 2006, And ongoing</p>	<p>Community Support</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)</p> <p>Business/Community Leaders, Students, Parents</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 1.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Implement GEE Waiver Policy for students with disabilities beginning with 2005-06 seniors. This new policy will allow more students with disabilities to graduate by granting the waiver of one Exit Test when the student’s disability significantly interferes with the ability to pass the test, provided all other graduation criteria are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final adoption of policy by BESE at October 2005 meeting • LDOE personnel draft GEE Waiver procedures • GEE Waiver becomes rule in November 2005 • LDOE personnel finalize GEE Waiver procedures • Letters to LEAs indicating timelines/procedures for GEE Waiver requests • LDOE committee reviews GEE Waiver requests and 	<p>2006-2013</p> <p>Oct. 2005</p> <p>Nov. 2005</p> <p>Dec. 2005</p> <p>Spring 2006</p>	<p>State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of NCLB and IDEA Support</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>determines recommendation(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Superintendent makes final decision on GEE Waiver request(s) • Notice is sent to LEA indicating final decision • Evaluate GEE Waiver process/procedures • Review/Revise GEE Waiver procedures based on spring 2006 evaluation • Continue GEE waiver process and review annually to ensure successful outcomes for students 	<p>Bi – Annually</p> <p>Bi- Annually</p> <p>Summer 2006</p> <p>FFY 2006 – FFY 2012</p>	
Improvement Activity 1.3	Timelines	Resources
<p>Monitor the implementation of the LAA 2 alternate pathway to a high school diploma to determine how many students with disabilities benefit from this alternate pathway to the standard high school diploma.</p>	<p>FFY 2009-2013</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p>
Improvement Activity 1.4	Timelines	Resources

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana

State

<p>Revise graduation policies to allow students with disabilities multiple routes to earn a standard high school diploma:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A survey will be conducted of all states having high stakes policies for promotion/retention to determine various diploma options for students with disabilities, while continuing to maintain high standards for the process. • The survey will be reviewed to determine which states have policies that allow students with disabilities to graduate with an equivalent alternate diploma. • A task force of all appropriate stakeholders will convene to review survey results and make recommendations, which maintain high standards for students with disabilities, to State Department of Education for consideration. • The LDOE Assistant Superintendents will review the task force recommendations and submit to the State Superintendent. • The State Superintendent will submit appropriate diploma options to the high school redesign committee for their consideration for an agenda item. • The High School Redesign Commission will review and make recommendations for diploma options for BESE review. • BESE will refer its recommendations to the Parish Superintendent Association Committee and the Special Education Advisory Council for their recommendations. • The above-noted committees will make their required recommendations to BESE • BESE will approve the plan for an alternative diploma and recommend the development of a legislative package. • During the 2009 legislative session, the new diploma option will be enacted. • BESE will approve the new policies to be included in <i>Bulletin 741</i>. • The revised graduation policy will become rule. • By May 2009, Louisiana will graduate its first class 	<p>Completed</p> <p>March 2006</p> <p>April 2006</p> <p>May 2007</p> <p>February 2008</p> <p>February 2008</p> <p>March 2008</p> <p>To be completed after the Commission's recommendations are received</p> <p>Fall 2008</p> <p>Fall 2008</p> <p>August 2009</p> <p>January 2010</p> <p>May 2010</p>	<p>State Department of Education :</p> <p>School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>School Improvement & Accountability, Assessment</p> <p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>Parents</p> <p>Access Center</p> <p>National Post School Outcomes Center</p> <p>National Center on Secondary Education and Transition</p> <p>National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education</p> <p>Exiting Community of Practice</p> <p>Postsecondary Education Consortium</p> <p>National Information</p>
---	--	--

<p>using the revised graduation policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDOE will evaluate the new graduation requirements to determine need for revision. <p>Revise graduation policies to allow students with disabilities multiple routes to earn a standard high school diploma:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDOE Assistant Superintendents will review the task force recommendations and submit them to the State Superintendent. The State Superintendent will submit appropriate diploma options to the high school redesign committee for their consideration for an agenda item. The High School Redesign Commission will review and make recommendations for diploma options for BESE review. BESE will refer its recommendations to the Parish Superintendent Association Committee and the Special Education Advisory Council for their recommendations 	<p>Summer 2011 <u>Postponed to February 2008</u></p> <p><u>Postponed to February 2008</u></p> <p><u>Postponed to March 2008</u></p> <p><u>Postponed until Commission's recommendations received</u></p>	<p>Clearinghouse on Children who are Deaf-blind School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>School Improvement & Accountability, Assessment</p> <p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools Parents</p> <p>Access Center</p>
---	---	--

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA dropout rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Louisiana uses the National Center for Educational Statistics “event rate” definition of dropout. A drop out is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved education program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Dropout percent = Louisiana uses the National Center for Educational Statistics “event rate” definition of dropout. A drop out is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved education program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

The Pre-GED/Skills Options Program is administered by the Division of Family, Career and Technical Education. Enrollment in the program is voluntary; for students with disabilities, it involves an IEP Team decision to enter the program. LEAs are encouraged to have someone from the Pre-GED/Skills Options Program attend IEP meetings if the Pre-GED/Skills Options Program is being considered for students with disabilities. To enter the program, students must be 16 years of age or older, or turn 16 years of age during the year they are to enroll, and they must also meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Failed 8th grade Louisiana Educational Assessment Program for the Twenty-first Century (LEAP 21) English Language Arts or Math for one or more years.
- Failed the English Language Arts, Math, Science, or Social Studies portion of the GEE 21.
- Participated in alternate assessment.
- Earned no more than 5 Carnegie units by age 17.
- Earned no more than 10 Carnegie units by age 18.
- Earned no more than 15 Carnegie units by age 19.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the displacement and relocation of students may have a dramatic negative impact on the dropout rate in Louisiana during the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school during the 2004-2005 school year was 26.27%.

Table 2.1. Number and Percent of Students with Disabilities, Ages 14-21, Exiting

Exit Reason	N	%
No Longer Receives Special Ed.	1092	15.49%
High School Diploma	1228	17.42%
Certificate of Achievement	849	12.04%
Reached 22nd Birthday	205	2.91%
Death	54	0.77%
Moved, Known to be Continuing	1351	19.17%
Dropped Out	1852	26.27%
Locally Designed Skills Certificate	259	3.67%
Louisiana Equivalency Diploma (GED)	62	0.88%
GED and Locally Designed Skills Certificate	27	0.38%
Industry-Based Skills Certificate	21	0.30%
GED and Industry-Based Skills Certificate	4	0.06%
Certificate of Course Work/Activities Completion	45	0.64%
Total	7049	

Source: Special Education Public Counts from LANSER December 1, 2004 IDEA

Discussion of Baseline Data: From a strictly numeric standpoint, it appears that the dropout rate has increased from 2002-2003 (24.4%) to 2004-2005 (26.27%). This negative trend is acknowledged and addressed in the SPP. Louisiana recognizes that having a high dropout rate is a serious problem in our state for students with and without disabilities; the Department of Education collaborated across offices and divisions to address the needs of students who are not able to meet current high school graduation requirements. Improvement activities for Indicators 1 and 2 address the needs of our students who are not graduating from Louisiana schools.

In December 2004, the CIMP Steering Committee set the following goal for decreasing the dropout rate in Louisiana: Decrease the dropout rate from baseline of 26.27% to 17.7%.

The following incremental annual targets were set for the State Performance Plan:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	26.0%
2006 (2006-2007)	25.0%

2007 (2007-2008)	23.0%
2008 (2008-2009)	21.0%
2009 (2009-2010)	18.6%
2010 (2010-2011)	17.7%
2011 (2011-2012)	16.7%
2012 (2012-2013)	15.0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 2.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>High School Redesign Commission and Workgroups will recommend actions to assist the state in redesigning public high schools to address the academic needs of all general education and special education students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze data and trends in dropout data based on regular/special education, gender, ethnicity, rural/urban. Analyze assessment results for regular and special education students. Analyze data by individual LEA to identify school districts that show decrease in dropout rate according to trend data, as well as school districts that show an increase in dropout rate. <p>(See also Indicator 1, Activity 1.2 for additional activities involving the High School Redesign Commission.)</p>	<p>Oct. 2005 Ongoing</p>	<p>Personnel from State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Office of Student and School Performance</p> <p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Personnel from the Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)</p> <p>Business/Community Leaders</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the implementation of the regional drop-out prevention summits • Monitor implementation of the Project EMPLOY dropout prevention program 	<p>FFY 2008 – FFY 2012</p> <p>FFY 2009-ongoing</p>	<p>Students, Parents</p> <p>LDOE personnel</p> <p>Governor’s Office</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Louisiana Workforce Commission</p> <p>Louisiana Technical College System</p> <p>Department of Corrections</p> <p>Office of Juvenile Justice</p> <p>Department of Social Services.</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 2.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>As a component of Louisiana’s Proposal for National Governors Association (NGA) Honor States Grant Program, LDOE will develop policies and programs into a “safety-net” to prevent as many students as possible from dropping out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an Early Warning Data and Reporting System that signals 7th-9th grade teachers, counselors, parents and administrators when students need extra support. • Provide free access to ACTs Explore, Plan, ACT System • Create a web-based “Lifelong Learning Education Portal” through which a student can plan and monitor his/her academic progress from middle school though post-secondary education and into the workforce. • Develop a set of statewide “catch-up course” curricula and teacher training which double the amount of math/reading instruction, incorporate systematic and highly structured curricula and 	<p>2005-2007</p> <p>2005-2007</p> <p>2005-2006</p> <p>2005-2007</p> <p>FFY 2008</p>	<p>Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Office of Student and School Performance</p> <p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)</p> <p>Business/Community Leaders</p> <p>Student, Parent</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>teaching strategies, and make use of diagnostic assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with the National Drop-out Prevention Center to examine dropout data to target regional trends and access technical assistance as needed 		<p>National Drop-out Prevention Center</p> <p>National Center for Drop-out Prevention for Students with Disabilities</p> <p>Exiting Community of Practice</p>
Improvement Activity 2.3	Timelines	Resources
<p>Monitor the implementation of the DEWS program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine DEWS data to determine how many special education students are being captured in the DEWS system as “at-risk” 	<p>FFY 2008-2012 Completed</p>	<p>LDOE personnel</p>
Improvement Activity 2.4	Timelines	Resources
<p>The Office Content will monitor the effectiveness of statewide dropout prevention programs. More specifically, it will examine the performance of specific subgroups including students with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The state will monitor the implementation of Project Employ. ➤ The state will monitor implementation of Jobs for Americas Graduates (JAG). ➤ The state will monitor implementation of JAG AIM High! 	<p>FFY 2010-ongoing</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>Office of Content</p> <p>Superintendent’s Delivery Unit</p>
Improvement Activity 2.5	Timelines	Resources
<p>The Office of Content will assist high priority schools with data collection and analysis of at-risk student data, specifically for special education students.</p> <p>See related activities improvement Indicator 13</p>	<p>FFY 2010-2012</p>	<p>LDOE staff</p> <p>Office of Content</p> <p>Data Management</p>
Improvement Activity 2.6	Timelines	Resources
<p>The Office of Content will provide professional development related to dropout prevention for LEAs on an annual basis.</p>	<p>FFY 2011 - ongoing</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>Office of Content</p>

The Office of Content will monitor the submission of districts' dropout prevention plans		Literacy and Numeracy
Improvement Activity 2.7	Timelines	Resources
<p>The LDOE will work with select schools receiving technical assistance from the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. (2012-2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The state will ensure that parental involvement is key to the school/district technical assistance initiatives. ➤ The state will participate in NDPC-SD cadre meetings and disseminate information to key stakeholders. 	2012 – 2015	<p>National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities</p> <p>SPDG</p>

See also Indicator 13, Activity 13.1 for a related transition improvement strategy.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade-level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment)}}{\text{(total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient)}}{\text{(total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

There are four types of assessment for Louisiana students: LEAP/GEE, iLEAP, Louisiana Alternate Assessment 1 (LAA1), and Louisiana Alternate Assessment 2 (LAA2).

The **LEAP** is a criterion-referenced testing program that is directly aligned with the State content standards, which by law are as rigorous as those of NAEP. The LEAP measures how well students in grades four and eight have mastered the State content standards. The **GEE** initially is administered at grades 10 and 11, with students taking the English Language Arts test and the Mathematics test at grade 10 and the Science test and Social Studies test at grade 11. There are five achievement levels: Advanced, Mastery, Basic, Approaching Basic, and Unsatisfactory. A student must score at Basic or above to be considered proficient.

All **iLEAP** tests are aligned to Louisiana's Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs). The **iLEAP** covers English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies tests at grades 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9. Student performance on the CRT components of the **iLEAP** is reported in accordance with the same five achievement levels as LEAP (i.e. Mastery, Advanced, Basic, Approaching Basic, and Unsatisfactory). A student must score at Basic or above to be considered proficient.

LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2) is a criterion-referenced assessment, which is based on *modified* academic achievement standards, that allows students with persistent academic disabilities who are served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) to participate in

academic assessments that are sensitive to measuring progress in their learning. LAA 2 is administered in grades 4 through 11. Grade 3 students are not eligible for LAA 2; they will participate in LEAP or LAA 1. There are four levels of achievement: Basic, Approaching Basic, Foundational, and Pre-Foundational. A student must score at Basic or Approaching Basic to be considered proficient.

LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1) measures the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3 through 11 who do not participate in general State-wide assessments or the LAA 2. LAA 1 is a standardized, performance-based assessment that measures the Extended Standards, which are extensions of the Louisiana content standards in three areas: English language arts, mathematics, and science. Students assessed using LAA 1 receive one of the following three achievement level ratings: Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard, and Working Toward Standard. Students who score at the Exceeds Standard or Meets Standard level are considered proficient.

End-of-Course (EOC) tests measure whether students have mastered the knowledge, skills, and abilities at the End-of-Courses. The content of the assessments is based on Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs). In 2010-2011, only English II, Algebra I, Geometry, and Biology were administered EOC tests. There are four achievement levels students can score on the End-of-Course exams: Excellent, Good, Fair, and Needs Improvement. A student must score at Good or above to be considered proficient.

American College Test - Every 8th-11th grade student in Louisiana will participate in the EXPLORE/Plan/ACT series, which will be funded by the state, beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. This series of ACT tests will serve as a guide for teachers and families as to what each high school student needs in order to be prepared to achieve at high levels, starting in 8th grade. The role of ACT in the school accountability system will be considered by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) later this year.

All students, including those with disabilities, participate in Louisiana's testing program. The scores of all students who participate in the LEAP/LEAP/GEE, LAA 1, and LAA 2 are included in the calculation of the School Performance Score (SPS). Students taking alternate assessments are included in accountability calculations at the grade level in which they are enrolled in the Student Information System (SIS). Students taking LAA 1 or LAA 2 who do not meet the participation criteria receive a score of *zero* in SPS component calculations and a score of *non-proficient* in subgroup component calculations. Students who were displaced after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita were included in both the participation and proficiency rates for AYP purposes.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Measurement A: Of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size, the percentage of districts meeting the state's AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup is 68.1%.

Measurement B: The participation rate for students with disabilities in statewide assessment in mathematics is 98.68% and in English language arts is 98.71%.

Measurement C: The proficiency rate for students with disabilities in statewide assessment in Mathematics is 27.94% and in English language arts is 24.97%.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004: Measurement B - Participation Rate

Participation of Children with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments – Spring 2005

Indicator 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade-level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards:

Statewide Assessment -- Spring 2005		(a) Children with IEPs in assessed grades		(b) Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			(c) Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations		(d) Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards (LAA 2)		(e) Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (LAA 1)		Overall (b+c+d+e) -- Baseline		Children included in (a) but not in the other counts		
Subject	Grade	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Parental Exemption	Absent	Not assessed for other reasons		
		Math	4	11034	2426	22.0%	8064	73.1%	0	0.0%	498	4.5%				10988	99.58%
	8	7872	967	12.3%	6221	79.0%	0	0.0%	591	7.5%	7779	98.82%	0	44	49		
	10	5834	820	14.1%	3881	66.5%	0	0.0%	946	16.2%	5647	96.79%	0	49	138		
	Total	24740	4213	17.0%	18166	73.4%	0	0.0%	2035	8.2%	24414	98.68%	0	123	203		
E/LA	4	11036	2422	21.9%	8069	73.1%	0	0.0%	498	4.5%	10989	99.57%	0	29	18		
	8	7871	968	12.3%	6224	79.1%	0	0.0%	594	7.5%	7786	98.92%	0	42	43		
	10	5818	799	13.7%	3882	66.7%	0	0.0%	950	16.3%	5631	96.79%	0	46	141		
	Total	24725	4189	16.9%	18175	73.5%	0	0.0%	2042	8.3%	24406	98.71%	0	117	202		

Spring 2005 Assessment

Baseline Data for FFY 2004: Measurement C - Proficiency Rate

Performance of Children with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments – Spring 2005

Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade-level standards and alternate achievement standards:

Statewide Assessment -- Spring 2005		(a) Children with IEPs in assessed grades			(b) Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations			(c) Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations			(d) Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade-level standards (LAA 2)			(e) Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (LAA 1)			Overall (b+c+d+e) -- Baseline	
Subject	Grade	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Math	4	11034	1401	12.7%	2302	20.9%	0	0.0%	287	2.6%	3990	36.16%						
	8	7872	310	3.9%	845	10.7%	0	0.0%	405	5.1%	1560	19.82%						
	10	5834	174	3.0%	514	8.8%	0	0.0%	674	11.6%	1362	23.35%						
ELA	4	11036	1432	13.0%	1894	17.2%	0	0.0%	365	3.3%	3691	33.45%						
	8	7871	262	3.3%	508	6.5%	0	0.0%	492	6.3%	1262	16.03%						
	10	5818	128	2.2%	318	5.5%	0	0.0%	774	13.3%	1220	20.97%						

Spring 2005 Assessment

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Measurement:

In Louisiana, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is addressed in grades 4, 8, and 10 in the areas of English language arts and mathematics. A school will fail the subgroup component if any subgroup within that school fails the participation rate test, the ELA or math Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) status test or the safe harbor test. The alternate academic achievement standards for students participating in LAA 1 are used, provided that the percentage of proficient LAA 1 students at the district level does not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed. The NCLB standard for AYP calculation was followed. The baseline data used to report AYP are the 2004 data. The district AYP data for spring 2005 have not been finalized by the due date of the SPP; Louisiana will submit the 2005 AYP data after they have been finalized. In 2006, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will be based on grades 3-8 and 10.

Participation Rate

All students (with and without disabilities) in grades 3-11 are required to participate in the statewide assessment. The majority of students with IEPs participating in the regular statewide assessment use accommodations. Louisiana’s alternate assessment (LAA 1) is scored against alternate achievement standards for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) purposes only. Parents are not allowed to exempt students from the statewide assessment. If a student was absent during the assessment time frame, documentation is required to indicate long-term illness, short-term illness, death of a family member, or that the student is in protective custody. Students who were tested and did not receive an accountability

code are counted as *not assessed for other reasons*. There are two types of students that are counted in the *Not Assessed for Other Reasons*: 1) Students that did not take a test and the school did not provide an accountability (excuse) code, 2) Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in their first year of an English-speaking school, who were supposed to take a test, but did not. The lowest score (zero) is given for these students, which is then aggregated and included for reporting.

Proficiency Rate

The achievement level of *basic or above* is considered *proficient* in Louisiana on the statewide assessments. On the regular assessments, the percentage of students with IEPs scoring *proficient* without using an accommodation was significantly lower than the students who were provided an accommodation. At the district level, alternate achievement standards for students participating in alternate assessment (LAA 1) were used, provided that the percentage of students scoring proficient did not exceed 1.0% for all students in the grades assessed. If a district exceeded the one percent cap, a student record review was performed at the state level, and those students who did not meet LAA 1 participation criteria were given a score of *zero* in SPS component calculations and a score of *non-proficient* in subgroup component calculations. A second alternate assessment (LAA 2) is being developed that will be scored against grade-level standards. A percentage of the students presently participating in the regular assessment and scoring below proficient will be taking the LAA 2 assessment in the spring. It is expected that the students participating in this assessment will increase their proficiency rate, since the assessment will more appropriately assess the students' learning. At the state and district levels, emphasis must be on access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities, increasing the percentage in the least restrictive environment by providing teachers, regular and special, professional development on instructional strategies, provision of accommodations, and the benefits of inclusion.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
	Measurement A	Measurement B		Measurement C	
	Adequate Yearly Progress	Participation		Proficiency	
FFY		Mathematics	English Language arts	Mathematics	English Language arts
2005 (2005-2006)	68.1%	98.68%	98.71%	41.8%	47.4%
2006 (2006-2007)	70.0%	98.68%	98.71%	41.8%	47.4%
2007 (2007-2008)	73.5%	98.7%	98.75%	53.5%	57.9%
2008 (2008-2009)	75.5%	98.7%	98.75%	53.5%	57.9%
2009	80.0%	98.75%	98.78%	53.5%	57.9%

(2009-2010)					
2010 (2010-2011)	85.0%	98.75%	98.8%	65.2%	68.4%
2011 (2011-2012)	87.5%	98.8%	98.8%	65.2%	68.4%
2012 (2012-2013)	90%	98.8%	98.8	66.5%	70%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 3.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>A. Develop and implement instructional methods and strategies that are responsive to the needs of all students and enhance the performance of students with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organize a stakeholder group (linked to the stakeholder review groups referenced in Indicator 5) to review policies, procedures, and practices that facilitate or create barriers to implementation of research-based instructional practices for all students with disabilities. The review will include, but not be limited to, school improvement, accountability, assessment, administrators, special education, higher education, teacher quality/certification, and professional development. ➤ Identify common barriers and facilitators to implementing research-based instructional strategies ➤ Train stakeholder group to look for these common elements in policies and procedures ➤ Identify strategies to remove barriers and strengthen facilitators ➤ Submit the group’s recommendations for changes to the appropriate audience (e.g., State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, Council of Deans, Special Education Advisory 	<p>Completed</p> <p>2006-2007</p>	<p>Facilitated by outside consultant(s)</p> <p>Personnel from multiple LDOE Divisions (e.g., Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards and Assessments; Professional Development; Teacher Certification and Higher Education; Division of School and Community Support)</p> <p>Regional Education Service Centers</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>Validated Practices (VP) Initiative</p> <p>VP Initiative Stakeholder Group</p> <p>The Access Center</p> <p>National TA Center on Assessment for Children with Disabilities</p> <p>OESE Center on Assessment</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>Council).</p> <p>Note: Link the work of this stakeholder group to others noted in the SPP established to review policies, practices, and procedures.</p> <p>Revise the <i>General Education Access Guide</i></p>	<p>2006</p>	<p>and Accountability</p> <p>National Alternate Assessment Center</p> <p>National Center on Student Progress Monitoring</p> <p>LDOE and LEA stakeholders</p>
<p>B. A cross-department team led by the Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance from the LDOE, in collaboration with stakeholders e.g., Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), and families, will plan for coherent dissemination, implementation, and sustainability of Response to Intervention (Rtl). This plan will include integration with already existing models of intervention/instruction, [e.g., Reading First, Positive Behavior Support (PBS), Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), Learning Initiative Networking Communities for Success (LINCS), significant disability literacy initiative].</p>	<p>2005-2011</p> <p>Discontinued 02/13 APR</p>	<p><i>General Education Access Guide</i></p> <p>Access Center</p> <p>Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ)</p> <p>SIM Professional Developers</p> <p>National web seminars</p> <p>Validated Practices professional development sites</p> <p>Louisiana Statewide Improvement Grant (LaSIG) district/school sites</p> <p>Professional development sites (e.g., Reading First, Rtl, PBS, LINCS, IHE professional development site schools)</p>
<p>C. Partner with stakeholders to collaboratively develop new statewide assessments that align with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).</p>	<p>2011-2015</p> <p>Revised 02/13 APR</p>	<p>LDOE Staff Stakeholder Collaboration</p>
<p>D). The LDOE will support implementation of initiatives for K-12 students (e.g., Believe and Include Initiatives, Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy [SRCL] et. al.) that includes the design, implementation, and sustainability of improved school-wide plans for targeted schools, which focuses on improved performance of students with disabilities using varied research-based strategies to close the achievement gaps. Supports will</p>	<p>2007-2011</p> <p>Revised 02/13 APR</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>include online technical support and/or professional learning and linkage with existing reform efforts.</p>		
<p>E) Continue efforts to build the infrastructure for a Low Incidence Consortium that will guide pre-service and in-service personnel preparation activities. Use the Consortium and related groups to guide the professional development agenda (e.g., collaboration, teaming, access to the general education curriculum, instructional strategies, communication, positive behavioral support, disability specific support) of personnel serving these students and evaluate the impact of the effort.</p>	<p>2005-2011 (Discontinued)</p>	<p>Significant Disabilities Leadership Committee</p> <p>Deaf-blind Grant</p> <p>IHEs</p> <p>PTI</p> <p>Sensorially Impaired Advisory Committee</p> <p>LA Commission for the Deaf</p> <p>LA State Advisory Council of Early Identification of Hearing Impairments</p> <p>Access Center</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 3.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Develop and implement a four-year process for school-wide implementation of the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). The four components are described below:</p> <p>Component 1: Awareness/Exploration of SIM and the Content Literacy Continuum (CLC) District- and building-level stakeholders (i.e., principal, lead teachers, special educator) become aware or deepen awareness of SIM and its potential impact for improving the performance of students with disabilities.</p> <p>The district and school are willing to commit to support the implementation and sustainability of SIM, including SIM in the individual school improvement plans.</p> <p>The school(s) has (have) a culture of collaboration across departments. Administration and faculty work together in a healthy climate, and the school is committed to data-based decision-making.</p> <p>Schools will be chosen by an application process.</p>	<p>Cohort 1 FFY 2005</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>LDOE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>Component 2: Planning Partnerships are established amongst district and school leaders, LDOE, RESC, SIM professional developers, SIM coaches/mentors, and families. The school infrastructure, student data, school conditions, teacher needs, and teacher concerns are assessed (Safety and discipline concerns are NOT the major thrust of the School Improvement Plan).</p> <p>SIM professional development and implementation plans follow the National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards.</p> <p>Supported SIM professional development begins or continues</p>	<p>Cohort 1 FFY 2006</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>LDOE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p> <p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p>
<p>Component 3: Implementation Infrastructure is nurtured; there is ongoing PD and support, including the dialogue and discussion in Professional Learning Communities (PLC).</p> <p>Formative student performance data are collected and analyzed.</p> <p>SIM site-based professional developers and expert teacher leaders are cultivated.</p>	<p>Cohort 1 FFY 2006</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>LDOE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p> <p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p> <p>PLC</p> <p>Access Center</p>
<p>Component 4: Sustaining The induction of site-based professional developers and teacher leaders sustain implementation with fidelity, mentor novice teachers, build critical mass, and oversee site-based planning for implementation at all levels of the school.</p> <p>Connections and relationships are made with other districts' schools' practices (e.g., feeder schools).</p> <p>Formative and summative student performance data are collected and analyzed.</p>	<p>Cohort 1 2008-09</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>LDOE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p> <p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

		PLC
Improvement Activity 3.3	Timelines	Resources
<p>Revise the section of the <i>General Education Access Guide</i> for students with mild disabilities. The revision will incorporate accommodations and the uses of assistive technology.</p> <p>This revision will assist teachers in providing access to the general curriculum to students with disabilities, while providing them with guidance in the selection, administration and evaluation of accommodations and the need for assistive technology for instruction and assessment of students with disabilities.</p>	FFY 2006– FFY 2011 Completed	LDOE personnel across multiple divisions (e.g., Special Populations, Student Standards and Assessments, Professional Development, School and Community Support)
<p>Establish a team to review and revise, if necessary, the <i>General Education Access Guide</i> (to specifically address accommodation categories, accommodation conditions and accommodations used in statewide assessment).</p>	FFY 2006 Completed	<p>LDOE Personnel from multiple divisions and Regional Service Centers (RSC)</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p>
<p>Design and implement professional development for school districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation of PD 	FFY 2006 Completed	LDOE personnel
<p>After statewide assessment is administered, analyze data trends on students with IEPs and students with Section 504 plans to determine if the manual and related professional development were effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % receiving accommodations ▪ % not receiving accommodations ▪ % achieving proficiency 	FFY 2007 Completed	LDOE personnel from multiple divisions
<p>Send end-of-year survey to a sample of teachers to determine the usefulness of the <i>Accommodations Manual</i>.</p>	FFY 2007 Completed	LDOE personnel from multiple divisions
<p>Reconvene the team to review teacher surveys and revise, if necessary, the <i>Accommodations Manual</i>, <i>Professional Development Guide</i>, and/or the PowerPoint presentation.</p> <p>Coordinate accommodations activities (See also Indicator 1, Activity 1.1, where this activity also applies).</p>	FFY 2007 Completed	Personnel from multiple LDOE Divisions, Regional Service Centers, select LEAs and schools.
Improvement Activity 3.4	Timelines	Resources
Develop a Mild/Moderate State Leadership Team to		

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>complement the Significant Disabilities Leadership Committee. The purpose of the Mild/Moderate State Leadership Team is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support Louisiana’s Literacy and Numeracy Initiatives for improved academic performance for students with disabilities • To serve as an information resource to current practicing teachers, • To identify needs across the State for teachers of students with mild/moderate disabilities, • To inform current mild/moderate teachers of policy and practice, and • To serve in the capacity to advise the DOE on matters pertinent to special education. <p>LDOE leadership will meet; membership will be recommended by Regional Service Center and LDOE personnel. Planning via conference calls will culminate in a face-to-face meeting in the fall.</p>	<p>FFY 2008 – FFY 2010</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>LDOE personnel, university personnel, district personnel</p>
Improvement Activity 3.5	Timelines	Resources
<p>Hold data summits wherein LEAs are provided guidance on the examination of their respective data trends (related to Indicators 3 and 5). Via this process, LEAs will identify their areas of need based on the data analysis, and develop plans to address those needs. While follow-up efforts will be provided on a statewide basis, districts with the greatest discrepancy between performance on their Indicators 3 and 5 and the actual SPP targets will be identified and provided targeted assistance.</p>	<p>2011-2012 Discontinued</p>	<p>Consultant LaSIG project</p>
Improvement Activity 3.6	Timelines	Resources
<p>Provide support on instruction in Common Core State Standards to school and administrative personnel through Network Support Teams.</p>	<p>2012 Revised 02/13 APR</p>	<p>Network Support</p>
Improvement Activity 3.7	Timelines	Resources
<p>The Access Guide website will host a state electronic co-teaching guide which will have the capability of short video clips demonstrating promising practices in planning, implementing, and assessing/evaluating co-teaching models across the state. Through the development of quality indicators for co-teaching, an equitable means of choosing sites will be established and serve as an acceptable standard for submission and consideration for posting onto the website.</p>	<p>2011-2012 Discontinued</p>	<p>State Leadership Teams LaSIG DOE</p>
Improvement Activity 3.8	Timelines	Resources

<p>The LDOE will provide professional development, technical assistance, and improved correspondence to Department staff, local education agencies, and other stakeholders on assessment procedures and appropriate provision of accommodations for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>Discontinued</p>	<p>LDOE Staff LEA District Coordinators</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 3.9</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>The LDOE will provide professional development, technical assistance, and improved correspondence to Department staff, local education agencies, and other stakeholders on assessment procedures and appropriate provision of accommodations for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>2012 – 2014 New Activity</p>	<p>Office of Assessment and Accountability, Division of IDEA Support</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 3.10</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>The LDOE will enhance accountability of internal/external data collection and reporting procedures for students with disabilities through improved internal collaboration and planning. <i>Discussion:</i> This activity is being added to assist LEAs in the transition to Common Core State Standards as we strive to close the achievement gap of students with disabilities on statewide assessments.</p>	<p>2012 – 2014 New Activity</p>	<p>Office of Assessment and Accountability, Division of IDEA Support</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Indicator 4A: The LDOE reviewed discipline data and ranked LEAs on the absolute and relative (percentage of IDEA child count) number of unduplicated counts of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 cumulative days. Discrepancies were computed by comparing rates of suspensions/expulsions of students with disabilities among LEAs. *Significant discrepancy* was defined by an internal panel which reviewed the absolute and relative rankings of the LEAs with students with long-term suspensions and expulsions. Criteria for significant discrepancy were determined to be met if either of the following is found:

1. Absolute – the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative school days is equal to or greater than 20.
2. Relative – The percentage of the LEA - IDEA Child Count removed for more than 10 cumulative days is equal to or greater than 2%.

The LDOE has monitored school districts identified with significant discrepancies of students with disabilities removed for disciplinary reasons according to the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process. School districts that were monitored were provided with a report indicating any instances of noncompliance and were required to write and implement a corrective action plan designed to address the noncompliance. The LDOE also has established a Model Master Discipline Plan (MMDP) that emphasizes a systemic approach to positive behavioral support in addressing discipline. The Model Master Discipline Plan provides a blueprint for the development of local policies, practices and procedures that rely on data-driven, proactive, educational approaches to behavior.

Indicator 4.B. This is a new indicator. To determine baseline data for Indicator 4.B, the LDOE will analyze 2004-05 discipline data, using the data that were reported for Table 5, Section B, Columns 3A, 3B, and 3C, *Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days of the Annual Report of Children Served* submitted to OSEP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Indicator 4.A. Percent of districts identified by the state as having significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year is 24.1%.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Indicator 4.B. Percent of districts identified by the state as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity is 21.5%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Indicator 4.A. The source for data and graphs in this section is the state’s 618 Data and Table 5, Section A, Columns 3A, 3B, and 3C, report of *Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More Than 10 Days of the Annual Report of Children Served*. Data for students with disabilities are compared among LEAs in the state.

The total number of LEAs applying for IDEA funding in Louisiana during 2004-2005 was 79. The 19 districts meeting the criterion for significant discrepancy was divided by the total number of LEAs and multiplied by 100 to arrive at 24.1%.

Indicator 4.B. Because this was a new indicator in FFY 2004, baseline data are reported for FFY 2005. To analyze the data for Indicator 4.B, LEAs will be compared to one another using weighted risk ratios for students with disabilities being suspended or expelled for each ethnic group. Weighted risk ratios will be calculated with formulas derived from the OSEP *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide*. Significant discrepancy will be defined as any district having a weighted risk ratio equal to or greater than 1.5, with a cell size of 10 or more.

There were 17 LEAs that had significant discrepancies in their rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days per school year for children with disabilities who were black. The criterion for a significant discrepancy was a weighted risk ratio of 1.5 for districts with identifiable groups of 10 or more for any ethnic group. The only ethnic group that had significant discrepancies was black students.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target (4.A)	Measurable and Rigorous Target (4.B)
2005 (2005-2006)	24.1%	

2006 (2006-2007)	21.5%	
2007 (2007-2008)	19.0%	
2008 (2008-2009)	16.5%	0%
2009 (2009-2010)	13.9%	0%
2010 (2010-2011)	11.4%	0%
2011 (2011-2012)	9.0%	0%
2012 (2012-2013)	7.0%	0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicators 4.A and 4.B:

Improvement Activity 4.1	Timelines	Resources
Targeted Assistance through web-based training <ol style="list-style-type: none"> LDOE will provide professional development and materials through various web-based programs. Districts identified as being discrepant will have available specific materials of the requirements of the State's BESE Model Master Discipline Plan pursuant to the requirements of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act 1225 (2003) to ensure that positive behavior supports are being implemented with fidelity. The LDOE has posted on its website a comprehensive series of webinars of IDEA requirements regarding removal of students with 	FFY 2008- FFY 2012 Revised 02/13 APR	Louisiana Department of Education Office of Students programs Personnel from select LEAs and schools

<p>disabilities. A revised self-review instrument, previously developed by the LSU PBIS Project, will be required of all discrepant districts (4A and 4B).</p>		<p>PBIS Initiative</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 4.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Critical Data Analysis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LDOE will analyze data for this indicator across all districts and the past three years to identify districts for 1) further data review, 2) data verification, and 3) technical assistance. 2. Critical data analysis to examine the types of incidents that occur within significantly discrepant districts to guide the self-review process and identify the types of professional development opportunities that need to be offered. 	<p>FFY 2008- FFY 2012</p>	<p>Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>PBS Initiative</p> <p>Division of School & Community Support</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 4.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Professional Development Opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LDOE will increase the number of schools in which Positive Behavior Support is implemented. 2. LDOE will determine methods of assessing the extent to which schools with significant discrepancies that have indicated PBS has been implemented are implementing PBS with fidelity. 	<p>FFY 2008- FFY 2012 Discontinued</p>	<p>Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports</p> <p>National Dropout Prevention Centers</p> <p>Statewide PBS initiative</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 4.4</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Data Verification</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LDOE will develop and implement a data verification review for ensuring that data for this indicator are accurate. 	<p>FFY 2008- FFY 2012</p>	<p>Divisions of Student Learning Support, Educational Improvement and Assistance, and Planning, Analysis, and Information Resources</p>

Improvement Activity 4.5	Timelines	Resources
<p>1. LDOE will provide onsite staff development, training, and technical assistance in the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to districts identified as discrepant and/or disproportionate in the removal of SWD.</p>	<p>FFY 2011- FFY 2012</p>	<p>Division of Student and School Learning Support</p>
Improvement Activity 4.6	Timelines	Resources
<p>The LDOE through its eight PBIS consortiums will continue to implement the intensive version of the Prevent-Teach-Reinforce (PTR) PBIS tertiary model, including requiring in each consortium’s “Scope of Work” specified requirements that PTR trainings be offered to all districts. Districts targeted will include discrepant districts.</p>	<p>FFY 2011- FFY 2013 Revised 02/13 APR</p>	<p>PBIS Initiative, LEA personnel, SPDG</p>
Improvement Activity 4.7	Timelines	Resources
<p>The LDOE will provide oversight of the implementation of the BESE model Master Plan as a part of its data driven Performance- based Monitoring (PBM) process of districts.</p>	<p>FFY 2011- 2012 Discontinued</p>	<p>Office of Federal Program Support, Division of Student and School Learning Support</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Louisiana has put forth considerable effort in the last six years to increase the number of students with disabilities being served in “regular” settings, as well as to decrease the number of students with disabilities being served in separate settings, all the while acknowledging that placement is a decision individually made for each student based on his/her IEP’s identified needs. These efforts are evidenced in placement data trends for students with disabilities ages 6 through 21. In school year 2003-2004, 49.6% of these students were removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day. This figure was more than 10 percentage points higher than the 39.4% served in that setting category four years earlier (1999-2000). During this same time frame, an equally dramatic decrease was noted in the percent of students removed from the regular class for greater than 60% of the day. In school year 1999-2000, 32.3% of students with disabilities were served in this category, as compared with 22.3% in 2003-2004. Positive trends were also noted in reduction of placements in public/private separate schools and in residential settings. In 2003-2004, 1.8% of students were served in this placement category, as compared to 2.3% in 1999-2000.

These improvements are likely attributable to the long-term initiatives Louisiana has undertaken to support students in the least restrictive environment. In 1997-1998, the LDOE, using resources from a federally-funded Systems Change Project focused on inclusive education, convened the Supported Learning Task Force. The task force assisted the LDOE in identifying specific gaps or weaknesses in services for students with disabilities and their families, so that priorities for service improvement could be identified for the next five years. The work of this group formed the basis of long-term improvement efforts, including building greater supports for students with disabilities within the regular education structure.

In February 2000, the LDOE was monitored by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. As a result, the LDOE received Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) citations for the fourth consecutive monitoring cycle. The LDOE convened a Steering Committee and LRE Task Force to develop a plan to address the federal citations. The recommendations of these groups helped to further focus and sustain LRE improvement efforts from a state level.

In 2001, the Division of Educational Improvement and Assistance was awarded a five-year State Improvement Grant (LaSIG). LaSIG has worked to improve Louisiana's service system in ways that meet the needs of all students better by improving special education services within the overall context of general education reform initiatives (e.g., accountability program, No Child Left Behind, school improvement process). At this point, LaSIG has operated in districts throughout all but one of the eight education regions of the state, working to fundamentally alter the way school improvement teams operate, ensuring that they address the needs of *all* students for whom they are responsible. This systemic approach to service delivery improvement has resulted in less restrictive placements for students with disabilities. Longitudinal LRE data for 2001-03 indicate LaSIG schools increased the number of students served in regular education by 9.63%, while the state increased by 4.2%. During that same time period, the LaSIG schools reduced placement in self-contained settings by 18.03%, while the state decreased by 7.1% (Source: December 1 IDEA; Louisiana data: 2001-2003 from State Special Education Data Profile). The work of LaSIG continues to inform the improvement process at all levels.

Considerable effort has been put forth to meaningfully engage families in the education process and to support family-school partnerships that work toward the provision of education in the least restrictive environment. These efforts have included a substantial increase in funding to Families Helping Families, a statewide network of nine family-directed resource centers that serve families and individuals with disabilities throughout Louisiana, and activities through LaSIG which have focused on building leadership capacity of families as they advocate for a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment and participate on school and district improvement teams.

The focused monitoring conducted by the LDOE is another vehicle through which Louisiana has attended to LRE issues. On an annual basis, stakeholders identify indicators of greatest importance for improved results for students, and LRE has been a focus indicator for six consecutive school years. Adding to the effectiveness of the focused monitoring outcomes is the increased scrutiny given to the quality of the corrective action plans developed by LEAs who receive citations via the monitoring process.

Also of note is the Validated Practices (VP) Initiative established in fall 2004 to assist the LDOE in developing a "blueprint" for building the capacity of the state to serve students in more inclusive settings. A steering committee, led by a national consultant, has been established to provide direction for this initiative.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline for placement of students ages 6-21 was established using data from the December 1, 2004 school year count. As indicated by Table 5.1, in school year 2004-2005, 53.13% of students with disabilities were removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day (regular class setting); 19.29% were removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day (self-contained setting); and 2.25% were served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements (separate setting).

Table 5.1 shows placement of Children with IEPs, ages 6-21

Types of Settings	Baseline			
	Dec. 1, 2003		Dec. 1, 2004	
	n	%	n	%
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day (regular class).	45,609	50.37%	48,131	53.13%
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day (self-contained class).	19,659	21.71%	17,476	19.29%
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements (separate setting).	2,108	2.33%	2,042	2.25%

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The percentages reported in this section may differ from those in the March 2005 APR; the SPP reflects 618 data as submitted to OSEP and includes private schools, while the APR data were for public schools only. As reflected in Table 5.1, the 2004 baseline data reflect movement to less restrictive settings across all three placement categories, as compared to the previous year's data (2003). During this time frame, there was a 2.76 percentage point increase in the percent of students served in the regular class setting, a 2.42 percentage point decrease in the percent of students served in a self-contained setting, and a .08 percentage point decrease in the percent of students served in a separate setting.

Further analysis of the baseline data is needed to inform the improvement process. Table 5.2 illustrates placement patterns across three major age groups (6-11, 12-17, and 18-21). Placements at both the 12-17 and 18-21 years of age categories were more restrictive in terms of the percent of students served in a self-contained setting (23.05% and 2.79%, respectively) and separate settings (25.32% and 8.24%, respectively).

Table 5.2 Placement of Children with IEPs at Ages 6-11, 12-17, and 18-21

Age Group	Outside Regular Class less than 21% of the Day		Outside Regular Class 21-60% of the Day		Outside Regular Class more than 60% of the Day		Public or Private Separate Schools, Residential Placements, or Homebound or Hospital Placements		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Ages 6-11	27413	63.86%	8738	20.36%	6364	14.82%	413	.96%	42928
Ages 12-17	18472	43.74%	12843	30.41%	9736	23.05%	1181	2.79%	42232

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

Ages 18-21	2246	41.33%	1364	25.10%	1376	25.32%	448	8.24%	5434
------------	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------	-----	-------	------

Source: December 1, 2004 IDEA Count

Based upon placement goals for students with disabilities set by the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Steering Committee, the following are targets established for regular class settings. Stakeholders discussed and set targets for separate settings, which included self-contained and separate site settings. Goals B and C were derived from these discussions.

Goal A: Acknowledging that placement is a decision individually made for each student based on IEP Committee identified needs, by 2011 all students in Louisiana will be placed in the most inclusive learning environment, as measured by an increase in the percent of students ages 6-21 in “regular” settings (outside regular education < 21% of the school day) to 67.61%.

Goal B: Acknowledging that placement is a decision individually made for each student based on IEP Committee identified needs, by 2011, all students in Louisiana will be placed in the most inclusive learning environment as measured by a decrease to 9.76% in the percent of students ages 6-21 in self-contained settings (outside regular education class > 60% of the school day).

Goal C: Acknowledging that placement is a decision individually made for each student based on IEP Committee identified needs, by 2011, all students in Louisiana will be placed in the most inclusive learning environment, as measured by a decrease to 2.08% in the percent of students ages 6-21 in separate settings (special public and private schools, special public and private residential schools, and hospital/homebound).

	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
FFY	Goal A	Goal B	Goal C
2005 (2005-2006)	55.30%	17.70%	2.22%
2006 (2006-2007)	57.76%	16.11%	2.19%
2007 (2007-2008)	60.22%	14.53%	2.17%
2008 (2008-2009)	62.69%	12.94%	2.14%
2009 (2009-2010)	65.15%	11.35%	2.11%

2010 (2010-2011)	67.61%	9.76%	2.08%
2011 (2011-2012)	62.5%	12.5%	1.8%
2012 (2012-2013)	62.5%	12.0%	1.6%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 5.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>Engage in a systemic process for creating and sustaining change at the state, district and building levels that includes frameworks and supports to enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>Organize a stakeholder group to review and evaluate policies, procedures, and practices that facilitate or create barriers to continuous improvement regarding placement (and performance, see Indicator 3) of students with disabilities (across both high and low incidence disability areas). The review will include, but not be limited to, school improvement, accountability, assessment, administrators, special education, higher education, teacher quality/certification and professional development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify common barriers and facilitators to continuous improvement. • Train stakeholder group to look for these common elements in policies and procedures. • Identify strategies to remove barriers and strengthen facilitators. • Submit the group’s recommendations for changes to the appropriate audience (e.g., State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, Council of Deans, Special Education Advisory Council). <p>Note: Link the work of this stakeholder group to others noted in the SPP established to review policies, practices, and procedures.</p>	2006-2008	<p>Outside consultant(s) facilitation</p> <p>VP Initiative</p> <p>Personnel from multiple LDOE Divisions (e.g., Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards and Assessments; Professional Development; Teacher Certification and Higher Education)</p> <p>Regional Education Service Centers (RESC)</p> <p>LEA/school representatives</p> <p>PTI/CPRC family representatives</p> <p>IHE</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

		<p>representatives</p> <p>Marketing consultant</p> <p>SPDG</p> <p>LRE Part B Community of Practice</p>
<p>Develop criteria to identify demonstration sites that engage in a continuous school improvement cycle (i.e., identify needs, implement plan, evaluate – maintain, modify, terminate, and attend to sustainability/ institutionalization or improvement efforts).</p> <p>Using the developed criteria, identify districts and schools engaged in systemic improvement efforts. Select districts based upon identified criteria, along with geographic and demographic considerations. Link with these to develop inclusive practices sites that result in improved outcomes for all students (e.g., success in closing the achievement gap). Ensure that both high incidence and low incidence disability issues are addressed, along with issues appropriate to reduction of placement in the most restrictive settings (i.e., self-contained setting, separate site setting). Promote data-driven decision-making within the sites. Provide support to these sites both internally and externally. Utilize learning communities, coaching, and mentoring to support and sustain change.</p> <p>These identified sites will be used to inform policy, professional development, and practice and serve as demonstration sites for other schools and districts. Develop supports for personnel statewide to access information about the policies, practices, and procedures of these sites that exhibit authentic school improvement.</p> <p>Write the “story” of achieving demonstration sites complete with elements necessary for success and communicate that message statewide through web campaigns.</p> <p>(Also, see Indicator 3, Improvement Activity 3.1.)</p>	<p>2006</p> <p>2007-2011 add sites annually</p>	<p>LaSIG districts and schools; SPDG–2006; Validated Practices district/school sites; LINCS; RESCs; District Improvement Teams; School Improvement Process – Revised (SIP-R); SWPBS Strategist Group (SIG); Family School Linkages (SIG); PTIs; CPRC; families; IHEs; Distinguished Schools; Louisiana Center for Educational Technology (LCET); Teaching and Learning Technology Centers (TLTC); Learning communities; VP Initiative website</p>
<p>Reconvene a group of diverse stakeholders to solicit further input into the refinement/addition of improvement activities that will positively impact Indicators 5 and 3. Utilize the report referenced in activity 5.1 in this effort.</p>	<p>February 2008</p>	<p>LDOE, SIG, IHE</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 5.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Establish a coherent professional development plan to create</p>	<p>2008-09 and</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

<p>collaborative school cultures. This will be planned and implemented by a cross-department team representing multiple divisions. The following components will be addressed: participants, framework, and content</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>LASPDG LASARD</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 5.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Create partnerships and frameworks among IHEs, LDOE, LEAs, and community members to provide high quality education professionals that will create inclusive schools that enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>Align/refine programs related to the newly approved redesigned general education-special education mild/moderate blended program (e.g., alternate path, Practitioner II program, add-on).</p>	<p>Spring 2006 Complete</p>	<p>Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) Access Center</p>
<p>Host IHE, LDOE, LEA and family partnership forum to address strategies for ensuring a highly qualified personnel work force. Utilize this forum to identify a mechanism for ongoing communication (e.g., types, frequency, function) among partners, identify short- and long-term priorities, recommend use of funds, etc.</p> <p>Research effective professional development school (PDS) models.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reexamine the factors contributing to PDS scores. • Establish website for posting effective strategies for supporting and nurturing IHE and PDS partnerships. <p>Use the partnership forum to serve as the launch for the 1) development, implementation, and evaluation of Professional Development Sites (PDS) and Professional Development Classrooms (PDC), and 2) recruitment and retention efforts. The forum will make recommendations regarding funding, structure, creation of incentives and supports to establish PDS and PDCs, etc. Embed this model into the new SPDG application in the spring.</p> <p>Use PDS and PDC sites for both initial certification and professional development purposes. Support these sites through Validated Practices Initiative and SPDG funds. Utilize sites to identify successful inclusive practices and evaluate associated outcomes for learners, as well as to implement other specific initiatives of the Department (e.g., Rtl). Include coordination of this activity with the “oversight” committee noted in Improvement Activity #1.</p>	<p>Spring 2006</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2006-07 and ongoing</p> <p>2006 and ongoing</p>	<p>SIG, FHF, CPRC, IHEs, SERCC, CTQ</p> <p>VP Initiative, IHEs, CTQ</p> <p>SIG FHF, CPRC SPDG IHEs SERCC CTQ LEAs VP Initiative</p> <p>SIG FHF, CPRC SPDG IHEs SERCC CTQ</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

		LEAs VP Initiative
Establish a long-term “Think Tank” committee to support the effort to identify, develop, implement and evaluate recruitment and retention models that blend state, local and IHE resources. Identify funding sources to recruit, retain, and support skilled personnel.	2006 and ongoing	SPDG, IHEs, VP, LEAs, PTI, families, outside consultant
Implement, enhance and evaluate a mentoring program to expose high school juniors and seniors to the teaching profession. Link to Teacher Cadet Program.	2007	IHEs, LDOE
Establish incentives and structures for local cooperative agreements between LEAs and IHEs regarding recruitment, selection, and induction to support new teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure newly hired teachers without appropriate certification meet requirements for admission into teacher education programs. • Investigate models from other states for joint (LEA and IHE) selection of non-certified candidates. • Assign new recruits to specific jobs. 	2008-2009	IHEs, LEAs
Create business and community partnerships around specific needs identified by stakeholders, e.g., transition specialists in smaller communities.	2009-2010	VP Initiative LDOE
Continue efforts to establish/support the Low Incidence Consortium to guide pre-service and in-service personnel preparation for low incidence disability areas.	2006 and ongoing	LDOE, IHEs, SPDG, PTI, families, LEA
Improvement Activity 5.4	Timelines	Resources
A. Convene a group of stakeholders (IHE, LDOE, LEA) to develop an action plan focused on use and expansion of the PDS initiative in partnership with the development and implementation of redesigned Mil/Moderate higher ed programs.	2008-09 and ongoing Discontinued	IDEA, IHE/LEA teams involved in redesign and PDS efforts, LDOE special education and certification representatives
B. Expand efforts to infuse the needs of students with disabilities across curriculum and instruction through efforts of transitioning to the National Common Core Standards.	On-going Revised 02/13 APR	Division of IDEA Support/IDEA Services; Network Teams, AIM Consortium, Louisiana Assistive Technology Institute (LATI)

Convene a group of stakeholders to examine placement data trends and determine how various initiatives/strategies underway are impacting placement practices. Use the findings to guide the design of future efforts. Link this effort with the work of the “world-class” special education program task force. Establish plans (structure, budget) for continuation of the Low Incidence Disabilities Consortium beyond the initial 3-year funding level.	2008-09 and on-going	IDEA funds, representatives from PDS, Low Incidence Consortium, literacy/RTI groups
Improvement Activity 5.5		
Establish a long-term “Think Tank” committee to support the effort to identify, develop, implement and evaluate recruitment and retention models that blend state, local and IHE resources. Identify funding sources to recruit, retain, and support skilled personnel.	FFY 2005, and ongoing	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 5.6	Timelines	Resources
Continue efforts to establish/support the Low Incidence Consortium to guide pre-service and in-service personnel preparation for low incidence disability areas. Establish plans (structure, budget) for continuation of the Low Incidence Disabilities Consortium beyond the initial 3-year funding level.	FFY 2005 Discontinued	Fully funded
Justification: In spring 2012, representatives from multiple Offices within the LDOE will convene to identify strategies for continued support for the Consortium	Timelines	Resources
Beginning September 2010, the LDOE began implementation of additional efforts related to Improvement Activities 5.3 and 5.4. These efforts entail holding “literacy dialogue” sessions with special education administrative personnel in each of 8 educational regions in the state. These sessions serve as a forum for district leadership personnel to examine their respective district standardized assessment data related to English Language Arts for both general and special education students. In addition, placement data are examined and participants are guided in a discussion related to 1) how placement decisions affect student’s access to the broad general education curriculum, and 2) how placement decisions affect student’s access to reading instruction delivered by a teacher highly qualified in that area.	2010-2011	LEA special education administrative personnel, LDOE literacy/special education staff
Improvement Activity 5.8	Timelines	Resources
Hold data summits wherein LEAs are provided guidance on the examination of their respective data trends (related to Indicators 3 and 5). Via this process, LEAs will identify their areas of need based on the data analysis, and develop plans to address those needs. While follow-up efforts will be provided on a statewide basis, districts with the greatest discrepancy between performance on their Indicators 3 and 5 and the actual SPP targets will be identified and provided targeted assistance. (Also refer to Indicator 3, Improvement Activity 3.5.)	2011-2013 (Discontinued)	Consultant LaSIG project

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In Louisiana, children with disabilities have historically been served in Early Childhood Special Education Settings (self-contained) at ages 3-5. As a result of the APR/SPP, Louisiana began concentrating technical assistance to LEAs statewide to assist them in serving children in settings with typical peers and in their natural environment, including childcare facilities, Head Start programs and at home. This policy has had a positive impact on the inclusive placement of preschool children over the last 10 years. The LDOE recognizes the concerns related to servicing children together regardless of their disability or level of need. To control for this, it is imperative the IEP Teams are diligent in writing down the specific needs of the student to ensure needs are met in the least restrictive environment or in the most appropriate setting.

Baseline Data from FFY 2011-2012 :

2011-12	Measurement A Baseline = 21.2% Measurement B Baseline = 4.29%
---------	--

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Louisiana was able to begin collecting data for the new settings established by OSEP in 2010 for Indicator 6 on July 1, 2010. From the data collected across the state, Louisiana was able to establish the above Baseline with the assistance of our Special Education Stakeholder Group.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	Not Required
2010 (2010-2011)	Not Required
2011 (2011-2012)	Measurement A Baseline = 21.2% Measurement B Baseline = 4.29%
2012 (2012-2013)	Measurement A Measurable and Rigorous Target = 22% Measurement B Measurable and Rigorous Target = 4.0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

Improvement Activities for this indicator were established using the 2011-12 data.

<u>Improvement Activity 6.1</u>	<u>Timeline</u>	<u>Resources</u>
The LDOE supports engagements with Special Quest to assist two selected school districts with options and recommended practices to facilitate more inclusive practices for children with disabilities in general education preschool programs.	Year One FFY 2011-12 Year Two FFY 2012-13	LDE preschool staff, SpecialQuest consultants, School District Personnel, Regional Field Staff
Improvement Activity 6.2		
The LDOE conducts an annual Preschool and Kindergarten Conference. The conference highlights breakout sessions geared for Special Education preschool staff to inform them on best practices for integrating and maintaining participation of preschool disabled children in the least restrictive environment.		
Timeline: January 2012 Resources: Selected university Personnel and LDOE personnel		
<u>Improvement Activity 6.3</u>	<u>Timeline</u>	<u>Resources</u>
The LDOE conducts visits to early childhood classrooms across the state. A research based environmental preschool rating scale is used by the LDOE for evaluation of all preschool programs, including an analysis of the extent that children with disabilities are included in regular PreK class activities.	School Year 2011-12	LDE personnel, contractors and regional field staff
<u>Improvement Activity 6.4</u>	<u>Timeline</u>	<u>Resources</u>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

The LDOE facilitates a three-year grant to conduct the Louisiana Early Education Program (LEEP) Institute to allow students and teachers to take college courses needed to become certified in Early Intervention and work with children 3-5 years of age who have disabilities.	Summer 2012 Summer 2013	Institutes of Higher Education
--	----------------------------	--------------------------------------

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# 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 (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator for the 2005 SPP that required the reporting of status data for FFY 2005. Baseline data, targets and improvement activities are reported as of February 1, 2008.

In order to address Indicator 7, an Assessment Task Force was formed in August 2004. Stakeholders participating on the task force and involved in making determinations are IDEA staff, Section 619 Coordinator, Regional Early Childhood Special Education Coordinators, university personnel, Part C staff, Head Start Coordinator, family members, Early Interventionists - Part C and Part B and LEA personnel. This task force has been guided by nationally recognized consultants who have assisted the group onsite in researching assessment tools.

A recommendation was made to use the comprehensive Assessment, Evaluation and Program System (AEPS) during the 2005-2006 school year. Required statewide training in how to administer the AEPS was provided for a team from each LEA during December 2005, and the AEPS was administered in spring 2006 to all students within six weeks of entering Early Childhood Special Education programs (ECSE). Children were assessed to establish an entry score using either the AEPS LEVEL 1 (Form 1), for children with the developmental age of birth to three years, or the AEPS LEVEL 2 (Form 2) for children with the developmental age of 3 through 5 years.

During the 2006-2007 school year, the AEPS is being administered to all students entering and exiting preschool programs. The AEPS exit assessment is given to students within six weeks of the 6th birthday or at the end of the age-appropriate kindergarten year. When entry and exit data for each individual student are compared, the percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improvement is determined. AEPS has been constructed using norms to provide information for reliable comparison with comparable, same-aged peers.

Status Data for FFY 2005:

During the 2005-2006 school year, the AEPS-RV was administered to all students entering preschool programs in order to establish current functioning levels prior to instruction. The AEPS-RV was used to measure three areas of growth: Social-Emotional (including social relationships), Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy), and Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. A problem occurred in converting some of the data to scores showing the percentage of children functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. Although districts completed entry testing and reported data to LDOE, scores in Table 7.1., comparing outcomes of special education children to same-aged children, represent 78% of the school districts' reported data.

Table 7.1

The number and percentage of children who are functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, and the number and percentage of children who are not functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers as reported in February 1, 2007 APR.

Part B State Performance Plan: 2005-2012

Outcome Skill Areas	Children who are functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		Children who are not functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A. Positive social-emotional skills	2111	65.0	840	35.0
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	2042	64.0	908	36.0
C. Use of appropriate behaviors	2037	67.0	914	33.0

Source: children, ages 3-5, who entered Part B of 619 from January 1- October 31, 2006, and were assessed. The results of AEPS-Research Version were entered into SER and were manually analyzed by Dr. Kristie Pretti-Fronczak.

Statement for AEPSi Users: Criteria for Comparisons with Same-aged Peers

The Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS[□] – Bricker, 2002) is a curriculum-based assessment. To meet the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) child outcome reporting requirements, specific AEPS Test items were aligned to the three OSEP child outcomes. Further, empirically derived same-aged peer benchmarks were generated to address Time 1 (near entry) and Time 2 (near exit) OSEP reporting categories. The AEPS Test same-aged peer benchmarks were constructed using a national non-random sample of children with the chronological ages of birth through 5 years of age (i.e., 0-72 months). The sample consisted of 1163 children on whom the Birth to Three Level of the AEPS Test was completed (19% were developing typically), and 2115 children on whom the Three to Six Level of the AEPS Test was completed (51.5% children were developing typically).

Rasch measures (logits) were used to establish age-expected functioning benchmarks and cut scores utilizing the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) recommendations for defining age-expected functioning. Specifically, a criterion of 10% of the population was set as the boundary for identifying children **not** functioning comparably to same-aged peers for three-month intervals and 90% of the population as the boundary for children who were functioning comparably to same-aged peers. The 90/10 criteria were established with a regression-informed line. A regression-informed line was developed using the scores on aligned AEPS Test items (transformed to Rasch measures) and ages of the children in the sample. The intercept of the resulting line was then adjusted until the 90/10 criteria could be determined. Children with scores at the line or above were considered to be functioning as same-aged peers. Children below the regression-informed line were considered to be functioning below same-aged peers. For ease of interpretation, the Rasch measures (logits) were transformed back to the AEPS scale. Lastly, an additional cut score line was created for the purpose of making OSEP time two reporting decisions. A similar regression-informed line was developed using the same process described above with a different criterion informed by ECO recommendations (i.e., second regression line set at a 96/4 criterion).

Progress Data for FFY 2006:

All children in the state who enter Part B Early Childhood Programs will be assessed using AEPS to determine how they compare with same-aged peers. The percentages in Table 7.2 show how the children scored in each of the three targeted outcome measurements. The entry data are initially put into

one of two categories: 1) functioning the same as same-aged peers or 2) not functioning the same as same-aged peers. OSEP has assigned five growth categories for states to use in determining outcomes when comparing a child’s entry and exit data. The category in which the child’s AEPS score in each outcome area is placed is determined by analyzing the difference between the entry score and the exit score. Dr. Kristie Pretti-Fronczak, a co-author of AEPS, is analyzing the AEPS-Research Version scores. She will continue to do this for those children who are tested using the AEPS-RV upon entry and exit Part B (2010). On July 1, 2007, the state began using the full AEPS with results entered on AEPSi, a subsidiary of Brookes Publishing. The scores for those children who began receiving services on or after July 1, 2007 will be analyzed electronically by Brookes and will be reported to the state.

Table 7.2 Early Childhood Performance

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	32	4.4
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	140	19.1
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	9	1.2
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	48	6.5
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	505	68.8
Total	N = 734	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	20	2.7
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	108	14.7
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	11	1.5
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	47	6.4
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	548	74.7

Total	N = 734	100%
--------------	---------	------

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	17	2.3
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	83	11.3
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	11	1.5
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	43	5.9
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	580	79.0
Total	N=734	100%

FFY 2006 Status Data:

Table 7.3

Outcome Skill Areas	Children who are functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		Children who are <u>not</u> functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A. Positive social-emotional skills	2724	73.2	998	26.8
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	2601	69.9	1121	30.1
C. Use of appropriate behaviors	2723	73.2	999	26.8

Source: children, ages 3-5, who entered Part B of 619 from January 1- October 31, 2007, and were assessed. The results of AEPS-Research Version were entered into SER and were manually analyzed by Dr. Kristie Pretti-Fronctzak.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Measurement A Positive social-emotional skills	Measurement B Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Measurement C Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs
2009	Baseline		
2010 (2010-2011)	(Revised for new cut scores)		
	Outcome A. Positive social-emotional skills		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	63.0%	
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	67.5%	
	Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectations for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	63.0%	
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	57.5%	
	Outcome C. Appropriate behaviors to meet needs		
Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	70.5%		
The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	74.0%		
2011 (2011-2012)	Outcome A. Positive social-emotional skills		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	63.5%	
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	68.0%	
	Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectations for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	63.5%	
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	58.0%	
	C. Appropriate behaviors to meet needs		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	71.0%	
The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	74.5%		
2012 (2012-	Outcome A. Positive social-emotional skills		
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this		

2013)	outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	64.0%
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	68.5%
	Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectations for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	64.0%
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	58.5%
	Outcome C. Appropriate behaviors to meet needs	
	Of those children who entered the program below age expectation for this outcome, the percent that will substantially increase their rate of growth in the outcome by the time they exit.	71.5%
	The percent of children who will be functioning within age expectation in this outcome by the time they exit.	75.0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 7.3	Timeline	Resources
A. A two-day Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Conference held annually to enable teachers to attend sessions dealing with content and subject matter in early childhood education.	FFY 2007-2012 Discontinue	National, regional, local, and LDOE presenters
B. Evaluate preschool programs, including assessment of the extent that children with disabilities participate in all class activities. LDOE targets assistance where needs are determined to be the greatest	FFY 2007-2010	Program Consultants (LDOE), Contract staff with expertise and experience with early childhood education
C. Provide in-service to districts to instruct how to use the preschool data system.	FFY 2010, 2011, & 2012	Brookes Publishing
D. Update meetings for special education supervisors, preschool coordinators, and Part C state and regional staff are held each year during the fall and spring in various parts of the state to discuss early childhood issues and concerns.	FFY 2010, 2011, & 2012	LDOE Staff
E. Individualized technical assistance for each district relative to the preschool data system.	FFY 2010, 2011, & 2012	LDOE Staff, Brookes Publishing Company
F. LDOE representative attended the Early Childhood Outcomes Conference.	FFY 2010, 2011, & 2012	NECTAC ECO Conference
G. Technical Assistance visits to preschool programs, including assessment of the extent that children with disabilities participate in all class activities. LDOE targets assistance where needs are determined to be greatest.	FY 2010, 2011, & 2012	Program Consultants (LDOE), Contract staff with expertise and experience with early childhood education

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator for FFY 2004, and it is reporting in FFY 2005.

LDOE contracted with a private provider to develop a comprehensive process for sampling and administering the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Parent Survey. The contract proposal for this process was prepared and delivered to LDOE in November 2005. LDOE and the contractor administered the Parent Survey in cooperation with a statewide network of nine Families Helping Families (FHF) family resource centers.

Other stakeholder organizations who partnered with LDOE to fully engage parents in completing the comprehensive survey were Families Helping Families Resource Centers (FHF), Project PROMPT (Louisiana's Parent Training and Information Center), Pyramid Parent Training Center (Louisiana's Community Parent Resource Center), and Louisiana's State Improvement Grant (LaSIG) network of family facilitators. Reports on the information derived from responses to the NCSEAM Survey enabled LDOE 1) to develop activities to help parents to feel more fully involved in their children's education, and 2) to assist schools and districts in developing research-based, meaningful activities to involve parents and family members as full partners in the education of their children with disabilities. The invaluable information derived from the survey encouraged the development of authentic activities specifically designed to make parents and family members of children with disabilities feel as if they are full participants in every aspect of the school environment. The resulting outcomes from family involvement should show improved results for children with disabilities. The data provided by the parent survey identified areas of need from the direct voice of parents of children with disabilities in Louisiana.

A change had to be made to Louisiana's original sampling plan. Prior to Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, the Orleans Parish School System was to be included in the sampling plan every year because the district served more than 50,000 students. After the hurricane, the school system was forced to shut down, and even a year later serves far fewer than 50,000 students. This change in the number of students dropped Orleans from the list of districts annually selected in the original sampling plan.

Of the 1,200 surveys mailed out, 125 (10.4%) were returned. This number did not meet the goal set in the sampling plan of 400 responses (33.3%). Therefore, a Parent Phone Contact Protocol was written by the contractor and disseminated to staff members working for Families Helping Families (FHF). Staff then contacted parents by phone, reading from the scripted protocol, reminding them to complete this important survey about their children's schools. If the parents had not kept the original survey sent in the mail, a new survey was sent to them; if parents could not read the survey, FHF

staff also offered to read it to them over the phone or in person. As a result of follow-up phone calls, the number of completed parent surveys increased from 125 (10.4%) to 231 (19.2%).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Of the 231 parent responders, the percentage of parents of a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 39% ($89 \div 231 \times 100 = 39\%$).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Table 8.1 Demographics of 231 Survey Respondents			
Race/Ethnicity		Child's Grade Level	
Caucasian	55.8%	Preschool	0.9%
Black/African-American	38.5	Kindergarten – Grade 5	39.0
Hispanic or Latino	0.4	Grade 6 – Grade 8	23.4
Multi-racial	2.6	Grade 9 – Grade 12 and over	30.7
Information Not Provided	2.6	Information Not Provided	6.1

An analysis of the survey demographics shows responses which are representative of the state's racial and ethnic groups, as well as student grade levels. Although representative, the survey results should be viewed with caution when drawing conclusions concerning Louisiana's school systems' efforts to partner with parents. Survey responses will continue to be collected in the remaining school systems at least once during the 6-year cycle of the SPP. Because the sampling is representative of the state's population, the figures reported as baseline are believed to reflect the opinions of parents statewide.

The standard used for data analysis was set by a group of national stakeholders who worked with NCSEAM in developing the parent survey items, ranking them in order according to field-tested parent responses. Stakeholders set a standard which they determined was the minimum level expected to elicit "Agree" responses from parents in schools appropriately partnering with parents of special education students.

That standard is a .95 likelihood of a response of "agree," "strongly agree" or "very strongly agree" with item # 25 on the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale, "The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school." In field testing for the survey, parents are likely to agree with all items above # 25 on Table 8.2 when they agree with # 25, and parents are less likely to agree with survey statements below item # 25. Reading down the list of statements in Table 8.2, there is less and less parental agreement.

Louisiana Parent Survey Results

- Parents usually agreed with statements about their children's schools for the first 13 items listed at the top of Table 8.2. Parents perceived that schools were adequately addressing these Item Content areas.
- Parents usually disagreed with the statements about their children's schools for the last six items listed at the bottom of Table 8.2.
- Parents agreed and disagreed with the statements about their children's schools for the six items listed in the middle of Table 8.2 indicated in bold, italic type.

The bold, italicized statements in Table 8.2 show where parent responses are the most varied in the “agree” and “disagree” categories. These statements are the most likely to be changed from “disagree” to “agree” through the efforts of state and local improvement efforts.

Table 8.2 Schools’ Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS)		
Parent Participation Survey Items Ranked According to the Frequency of Agreement Responses by Louisiana Parents – From Highest to Lowest Agreement		
Item #	Location (Measure)	Item Content
4	490	At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.
11	492	Teachers are available to speak with me.
16	504	Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage.
9	505	My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.
10	505	Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.
1	507	I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.
12	511	Teachers treat me as a team member.
5	513	All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.
18	523	The school has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.
15	526	Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.
17	528	Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards.
14	533	Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities.
13	544	Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.
19*	550	The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.
22*	561	The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.
3*	564	At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.
20*	570	The school gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs.
6*	573	Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services.
23*	581	The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.
8	591	I have been asked for my opinion about how well the special education services my child receives are meeting my child's needs.
25	600	The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.
24	634	The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.

7	647	I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.
21	653	The school offers parents training about special education issues.
2	673	I was offered special assistance (such as child care) so that I could participate in the IEP meeting.

The results of the parent survey were tallied and analyzed by an outside consultant who, with input from the survey developers, presented the report to LDOE in December 2006. The recommendation of the report was that the 2011 measurable and rigorous target for the SPP should be improvement that exceeds the 95% confidence interval for the population percentage. In other words, improvement should exceed what would be expected through chance or standard error in the survey process. The outside consultant recommended setting a long-range target of 47%. The internal SPP Oversight Committee reviewed this decision and agreed, and members of the SPP Steering Committee were polled through email. Since half of the 2006-2007 school year is already over, and the results of the survey have not been distributed to enhance LEA efforts, the first target for 2006-2007 will be to maintain 39%, with increments of two percentage points a year through 2010-2011. When the SPP Steering Committee meets in May, the survey will be included on the agenda for discussion. Changes in the targets will be made if the committee elects to do so, and they will be included in the revision of the SPP in 2008.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	39%
2007 (2007-2008)	41%
2008 (2008-2009)	43%
2009 (2009-2010)	45%
2010 (2010-2011)	47%
2011 (2011-2012)	45%
2012 (2012-2013)	48%

Improvement Activity 8.3	Timeline	Resources
<p>Families Helping Families Resource Centers will provide support/training to teacher education programs at post-secondary institutions by providing information and making training available (for at least one class of general education students or special education students or a combination of both majors) in university-level classes on the importance of meaningful parental involvement in the provision of a free appropriate public education for students with disabilities.</p> <p>A. FHF centers will establish and maintain a vital, collaborative working relationship with institutions of higher learning, including regular communication on events and training opportunities.</p> <p>B. FHF centers will provide staff adequate to make presentations and/or provide special education/disability-related information to institutions of higher learning.</p>	<p>FFY 2006 – 2011</p>	<p>Families Helping Families (FHF) Staff</p> <p>LDOE Funding</p> <p>LDOE Staff and/or contracted persons/agencies</p> <p>Speakers/Presenters (paid and/or volunteers)</p>
Improvement Activity 8.4	Timeline	Resources
<p>A. The Department of Education will explore possible program collaboration opportunities across LDOE divisions and sections in an effort to help schools improve their facilitation of parental involvement in their children’s education.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part C Transition 2. Part B Transition <p>B. The Department of Education will explore and review possible program collaboration opportunities with other agencies/organizations in an effort to help schools improve their facilitation of parental involvement in their children’s education.</p> <p>C. The Department of Education will support 13 LaSIG pilot schools’ parental engagement initiative throughout the year with the following ongoing events: data collection, distance coaching and technical assistance days.</p> <p>D. The Department of Education will provide professional development for schools’ Family Facilitators to build capacity to continue outreach to families.</p> <p>E. The Department of Education will offer Family Empowerment Sessions for families of students with disabilities attending LaSIG schools. Topics to be covered include: IDEA, Conflict Resolution, Team Building and Negotiation.</p>	<p>FFY 2007 – FFY 2010</p> <p>FFY 2008 – FFY 2009</p> <p>Spring 2009</p> <p>January 2009 – May 2009</p> <p>September 23 and 25, 2008, and through FFY 2008</p>	<p>LDOE staff, Regional Service Centers, other agency staff, LEA staff</p> <p>Statewide professional education associations/organizations</p> <p>The Louisiana School Improvement Grant (LaSIG)</p> <p>The National Center on Special Education</p>

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator in FFY 2004, and baseline data were reported for FFY 2005.

Louisiana has disaggregated and analyzed child count data for the past five years. During 2000, 2001 and 2002, Louisiana used the Composition Index comparing the percentage of a particular race/ethnicity in the general education population to the percentage of a particular race/ethnicity in the special education population. Composition Index data were then analyzed to determine if substantial disproportionality existed through the use of 20% above and below cut-off values. The historical trend data indicate that Louisiana has disproportionate representation of Black students in special education.

During these same three years, district-level analysis was provided to districts for use in the self-review process. While the state-level analysis was conducted using 20% above and below cut-off values to inform staff of the nature and extent of disproportionality, the information provided to districts was their composition, with encouragement to examine social significance. The LDOE continues to participate in national technical assistance meetings with the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) and the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) to gain additional knowledge around disproportionality, analysis of child count data, and the setting of goals/targets avoiding the use of numeric goals.

With the *Annual Performance Report* completed in March of 2005, Louisiana converted to the use of risk ratio for analysis of disproportionality. Risk ratio directly compares the relative size of two risks by dividing the risk for being identified for a specific racial/ethnic group by the risk for being identified for a comparison group. Louisiana chose to compare the identified racial/ethnic group to all other racial/ethnic groups and answer the question, “What is a specific racial/ethnic group’s risk of receiving special education and related services compared to the risk for all other students?”

Table 9.1 shows 2003-2004 state-level risk ratio data for students with disabilities in Louisiana.

Table 9.1 Risk Ratios for All Children with Disabilities, Ages 6-21

Years	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	White (Not Hispanic)
2003-04	1.02	0.32	1.24	0.61	0.86
2004-05	1.01	0.33	1.23	0.60	0.87

Table 9.1 is based on Dec. 1, 2003, and Dec. 1, 2004, IDEA Part B 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served).

Louisiana is examining over-representation at this time, while acknowledging the need for further study of the under-representation of the Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic populations to ensure that these groups are receiving equal access to special education services. The stakeholder committee did not set limits for the point at which a risk ratio less than 1.0 would be considered significant. Louisiana has specific outreach to these groups through the development and distribution of Child Find posters and brochures in Spanish and Vietnamese. Louisiana has also recently developed a *Guideline for Assessing English Language Learners*. The LDOE will continue to explore the potential impact of under-identification and work to ensure equal access for this student group.

Thirty-four districts in Louisiana have a risk ratio greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students identified as having a disability according to 2003-2004 child count data. Louisiana now faces the task of determining if the disproportionate representation of Black students in special education and related services is due to inappropriate identification. The LDOE acknowledges that disproportionality data represent all students with current evaluations in a district, including those now residing in one district, but identified in another. Also, the initial identification of students many years ago may have occurred under very different policies, procedures and practices than are currently in use. This analysis serves only as a general overview of a district's identification practices.

First, Louisiana will calculate risk ratio for Black students with disabilities in the selected districts based on initial evaluations occurring in FFY 2003, FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. Louisiana will investigate disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification by analyzing the thirty-four districts already indicated to have disproportionate representation for Black students with disabilities.

Second, most other state indicators are a reflection of current performance or practices, while using total child count data is a reflection of practice over a span of years. LDOE proposes using time-limited analyses to determine whether current policies, procedures, and practices are impacting the disproportionate identification of minorities.

Identified districts that continue to display a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 will be directed to complete a district-level analysis of policies, procedures and practices and would include the submission of district-level policies and procedures pertaining to building-level identification and intervention and the special education referral, evaluation and determination process. In addition, the state may request copies of individual evaluations to review for discrepancies in the implementation of *Bulletin 1508, Pupil Appraisal Handbook*. A state team will review the documents and determine if the disproportionality data are the result of inappropriate identification.

In the event that the review of the district-level analysis and supporting documentation indicates inappropriate identification, the district will be required to complete a corrective action plan addressing policies, procedures, and practices that must be modified to assure correction within one year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006: The percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification is 0%. The actual raw data for this time period include eight targeted LEAs whose identification policies, procedures and practices were reviewed for overall disproportionate representation; none was identified as having inappropriate identification policies, procedures and practices (0 divided by 8 = 0%).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline data were compiled through record reviews and onsite monitoring. Ten districts with risk ratios for overall identification (Indicator 9) and identification of specific disability categories (Indicator 10) over 1.5 were targeted based upon 2005-2006 initial identification data. Four of the ten districts were selected for focused onsite monitoring, and six were selected for record reviews. When LDOE pupil appraisal staff examined the policies, procedures and practices for identifying students with disabilities, no evidence was found of noncompliant identification policies, practices or procedures. Table 9.2 shows how districts were targeted for monitoring Indicators 9 and 10.

Table 9.2

10 Districts Targeted for Review of Identification Policies, Practices and Procedures 2005-2006			
	Indicator 9	Indicator 10	
	High Risk Ratios	High Risk Ratios	High Risk Ratios
	Initial Evaluations	Specific Learning Disabilities	Mental Disabilities
District 1		4.93	
District 2	1.89		
District 3		2.59	2.52
District 4	1.75	2.08	
District 5	1.64	2.82	
District 6	2.15	3.07	
District 7	1.62	12.67	
District 8	1.63	2.04	
District 9	1.83	1.71	
District 10	7.64		
Total Districts Targeted for Indicators 9 and 10	8	8	

Source: Based on Dec. 1, 2006, IDEA Part B, 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served)

Louisiana is choosing to continue to use the cut-off score of 1.5 or greater to define disproportionate representation. Although Louisiana’s overall state-level data show there is no specific race/ethnic category with a risk ratio greater than 1.5, in the 2005-06 Child Count (See Table 9.3), there were 34 LEAs with risk ratios greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students receiving special education. Additional analysis is required, since the risk ratio analysis serves only as a general overview of the racial make-up of the population of special education students and does not constitute noncompliance.

Table 9.3. Risk Ratios for All Children with Disabilities, Ages 6-21

Years	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	White (Not Hispanic)
2005-06	1.05	0.32	1.24	0.56	0.87

Source: Based on Dec. 1, 2006, IDEA Part B, 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served)

Louisiana calculated the risk ratio for black students with disabilities in the selected districts based on initial evaluations conducted during FFY 2003, FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. Louisiana is now investigating disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. To determine if LEA policies, procedures and practices are appropriate, Louisiana examined the 34 districts identified as disproportionate using the following criteria:

1. Risk ratios for disproportionate identification during FFY 2005;
2. Trend data on risk ratios for initial evaluations during FFY 2003, FFY 2004, and FFY 2005; and
3. Trend data on risk ratios for initial evaluations for specific exceptionalities during FFY 2003, FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	0%
2006 (2006-2007)	0%
2007 (2007-2008)	0%

2008 (2008-2009)	0%
2009 (2009-2010)	0%
2010 (2010-2011)	0%
2011 (2011-2012)	0%
2012 (2012-2013)	0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 9.1	Timelines	Resources
Professional Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations in each of the state's eight educational regions regarding Response to Intervention (Rtl), to include one hour of training provided to Pupil Appraisal staff regarding disproportionality issues 	May 2007 Complete	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.2	Timelines	Resources
Require districts to form district- and school-wide teams to complete NCRESST developed surveys on culturally responsive practices.	December 2007 Complete	IDEA LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.3	Timelines	Resources
Seek Technical Assistance: Quarterly consultation and training with NCRESSt	Quarterly through May 2007 Complete	NCRESSt LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.4	Timelines	Resources
Data Analysis: Review NCRESSt district and school surveys to determine inappropriate practices in order to target professional development activities to assist LEAs in adopting strategies to reduce inappropriate identification.	Dec 2007 Complete	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.5	Timelines	Resources

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

Professional Development: Statewide training in Systematic Change for Culturally Response, Inclusive Educational Systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in training to prepare for using the “Trainer-of-Trainers” Model for professional development • Formation of teams of trainers in Louisiana to train all LEAs • Job-Embedded Professional Development for all districts in Louisiana 	October 2006 Jan 2007 – 2011 Complete	NCRESSt LDOE and LEA Staff
Improvement Activity 9.6	Timelines	Resources
Continued consultation with Southeast Regional Resource Center regarding issues of disproportionality	June 2008 Complete	SRRC LDOE Staff LA Sig Staff
Improvement Activity 9.7	Timelines	Resources
Consultation with NCCRESt regarding use of District Rubric and characteristics of a culturally responsive school.	June 2008 Complete	NCCRESt LASig Staff LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.8	Timelines	Resources
Consultation with Dr. James Patton from William and Mary College, a known expert regarding disproportionality, to assist the State in developing a thorough State Plan to more effectively address disproportionality.	June 30, 2008 Complete	Dr. Patton LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.9	Timelines	Resources
Implement a 3-tiered system to address issues of disproportionality within districts with a risk ratio of >1.50 for all students with disabilities and within a specific exceptionality.	Dec 2007 Discontinue	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.10	Timelines	Resources
Provide professional development for those districts identified with disproportionality regarding culturally responsive schools and information regarding specific exceptionalities. Professional development will include information on culturally responsive schools, as well as reviewing information about appraisal issues and specific exceptionalities.	June 2008 Complete	NCRESSt LDOE and LEA Staff
Improvement Activity 9.11	Timelines	Resources
A national consultant is being contracted to train LDOE regarding monitoring protocols and procedures	January 2009 Complete	Sue Gamm, Esq., LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.12	Timelines	Resources

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

A national consultant is being contracted to accompany the monitoring team to an onsite monitoring visit to act as a consultant in the monitoring process in an effort to identify inappropriate policies, practices and procedures	January 2009 Complete	Sue Gamm, Esq., “ LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.13	Timelines	Resources
A national consultant is being contracted to assist with reporting to the districts and making recommendations for improvement following an onsite monitoring visit	February 2009 Complete	Sue Gamm LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.14	Timelines	Resources
A national consultant has been contracted to research 25 states to determine how they are defining under-representation, summarize her findings, and make recommendations to our stakeholders group regarding setting a risk ratio for under-representation.	October 2008 Complete	Sue Gamm Stakeholders Group
Professional Development will continue with Dr. James Patton and Dr. Troy Allen regarding culturally responsive educational processes for all school districts	May 2010 Complete	Dr. James Patton Dr. Troy Allen, LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.15	Timelines	Resources
Presentation by Dr. Russ Skiba “Disproportionality And Discipline: Changing Practice, Changing Outcomes”	December 3, 2008 Complete	Dr. Russ Skiba La-Sig Staff
Improvement Activity 9.16		
Professional Development will be provided by Dr. Troy Allen regarding culturally responsive educational processes for all school districts	May 2010 Complete	Dr. Troy Allen, LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.17	Timelines	Resources
A national consultant is being contracted to assist LDOE with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-day workshop to help districts examine that the importance of fidelity of interventions is important to reduce inappropriate identification of students in special education. • Continued revision of monitoring protocols and procedures of the Self Review/Monitoring document • Conduct an onsite monitoring and act as a consultant to ensure protocols and procedures are followed as per directions. • To assist with the writing of report to the district and make recommendations for corrective action and/or improvement. • To provide technical assistance to those districts in Tier III of the monitoring process. 	June 30, 2010 Complete	Sue Gamm
Improvement Activity 9.18	Timelines	Resources
Thirteen districts supported by the Louisiana State Improvement Grant will receive the following professional development activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One district has contracted with Dr. Ruby Payne on reaching diverse students and reducing disproportionality • All districts will be conducting district-wide professional development on disproportionality • Districts will be utilizing the website “Truth about Labeling” • Attend a professional development activity on differentiated practices, instruction, assessment, and family engagement. 	May 2010 Complete	Dr. Ruby Payne Dr. James Patton LaSig Staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

Improvement Activity 9.19	Timelines	Resources
LDOE will continue with the grant that for the continued implementation and continuation of Positive Behavior Support in the State.	June 2012	LSU Positive Behavior Support Project
Improvement Activity 9.20	Timelines	Resources
Professional Development regarding “Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices” will be provided to teachers and administrators throughout the state.	June 2012	SPDG
Improvement Activity 9.21	Timelines	Resources
Professional Development will be provided to those districts identified with disproportionate representation regarding the use of the Louisiana Self-Review Tool and to assist them in examining their data	June 2010 Discontinue	LSU Positive Behavior Support Project
Improvement Activity 9.22	Timelines	Resources
Professional Development will continue regarding the Response to Intervention Model.	June 2012 Discontinue	Dr. Troy Allen DOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.23	Timelines	Resources
A national consultant will be contracted to develop online video modules to support Louisiana educators in developing awareness, knowledge, and skills needed to address disproportionality.	June 2010 Discontinue	LSU Positive Behavior Support Project
Improvement Activity 9.24	Timelines	Resources
An online web resource guild will be developed to aid Louisiana educators in developing comprehensive action plans to address disproportionate representation in academic and behavioral concerns.	June 2012 Discontinue	Dr. Troy Allen DOE Staff
Improvement Activity 9.25	Timelines	Resources
Online seminar outlining the current reality of disproportionality in Louisiana and best practices strategies toward remediation.	June 2010 Discontinue	LSU Positive Behavior Support Project

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator area in FFY 2004, and baseline data were reported for FFY 2005. For an Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process, see paragraphs one through three of Indicator Nine.

Below are the FFY 2003 and FFY 2004 Louisiana state-level risk ratio data for students identified in the six disability categories that states are required to examine. Review of written complaints, due process filings, and monitoring findings do not reveal any indication to explore the remaining seven disability categories.

Table 10.1 2003-2004 Risk Ratio Data by Disability Category

Race/Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaskan Native		Asian/ Pacific Islander		Black (Not Hispanic)		Hispanic		White (Not Hispanic)	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Mental Retardation	0.67	0.59	0.27	0.28	2.53	2.53	0.32	0.32	0.43	0.43
Specific Learning Disabilities	1.28	1.22	0.19	0.17	1.50	1.55	0.60	0.58	0.71	0.69

Emotional Disturbance	0.60	0.61	0.03*	0.08*	2.41	2.26	0.42	0.37	0.46	0.49
Speech or Language Impairments	0.94	1.03	0.62	0.59	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.84	1.35	1.35
Other Health Impairments	0.80	0.68	0.15	0.18	0.64	0.65	0.58	0.49	1.70	1.67
Autism	0.26*	0.29*	1.21	1.35	1.00	0.94	0.76	0.73	1.03	1.09

* Cell size less than 10

Based on Dec. 1, 2003 and Dec. 1, 2004, IDEA Part B 618 data (*Annual Report of Children Served*)

As indicated previously, Louisiana stakeholders met in January 2005 to discuss disproportionate representation and set cut-off values for significant disproportionality. A decision was made to consider a risk ratio of 1.5 or greater, with a minimum cell size of 10, to be significantly disproportionate and trigger further review, evaluation, and monitoring in that area. Since the language has changed in the current report to identify disproportionate representation rather than significant disproportionality, Louisiana is choosing to continue to use the cut-off score of 1.5 or greater to define disproportionate representation.

Disproportionate representation of Black students in the disability categories of mental retardation, emotional disturbance and specific learning disability continues to be above 1.5. Additionally, state-level data reveal a risk ratio greater than 1.5 for White students identified as Other Health Impaired. Subjective findings at this time indicate that White students experiencing emotional or behavioral concerns may be more likely to be identified as Other Health Impaired, rather than Emotionally Disturbed. A review of written complaints, due process filings, and monitoring findings does not reveal any reports or citations with regard to identification and racial bias.

District-level analysis reveals that Louisiana has identified 62 districts with a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students in the category of Mild Mental Disabilities. Similarly, there are 26 districts with a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students and one district with such a risk ratio for White students in the category of *Emotional Disturbance*. In the category of *Specific Learning Disability*, Louisiana has 56 districts with a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students, 1 with such risk ratio for American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 1 with such risk ratio for White students. In the category of *Other Health Impairments*, there are 3 districts with a risk ratio greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students and 26 districts with a risk ratio of 1.5 or greater for White students. While *Autism* findings are less pronounced, there are 4 LEAs with risk ratios greater than or equal to 1.5 for Black students and 5 LEAs with elevated risk for White students. While most racial and ethnic groups seem to be affected in some way, Black students present the greatest disproportionate representation according to the state- and district-level data.

Louisiana is examining over-representation in disability categories, while acknowledging the need for further study of the under-representation of the Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic populations to ensure that these groups are receiving equal access to special education services. The stakeholder committee did not set limits for the point at which risk ratio less than 1.0 would be considered

significant. Louisiana has specific outreach to these groups through the development and distribution of Child Find posters and brochures in Spanish and Vietnamese. Louisiana has also recently developed a *Guideline for Assessing English Language Learners* that may impact members of this population. LDOE will further analyze data surrounding the delivery of services to these populations.

The strategy to determine if disproportionality is due to inappropriate identification is the same as outlined in Indicator 9 and is restated in the next paragraphs.

First, Louisiana will calculate the risk ratio for Black students with disabilities in the selected districts based on initial evaluations occurring in FFY 2003, FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. Louisiana will investigate disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification by analyzing the thirty-four districts already indicated to have disproportionate representation for Black students with disabilities.

Second, most other state indicators are a reflection of current performance or practices, while using total child count data as a reflection of practice over a span of years. LDOE proposes using time-limited analyses to determine whether current policies, procedures, and practices are impacting the disproportionate identification of minorities.

Identified districts that continue to display a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 will be directed to complete a district-level analysis of policies, procedures and practices and would include the submission of district-level policies and procedures pertaining to building-level identification and intervention and the special education referral, evaluation and determination process. In addition, the state may request copies of individual evaluations to review for discrepancies in the implementation of *Bulletin 1508, Pupil Appraisal Handbook*. A state team will review the documents and determine if the disproportionality data are the result of inappropriate identification.

In the event that the review of the district-level analysis and supporting documentation indicates inappropriate identification, the district will be required to complete a corrective action plan addressing policies, procedures, and practices that must be modified to ensure correction within one year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005:

Louisiana did not complete the collection of baseline data during the FFY 2005 reporting period.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006:

The percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification is 0%. The actual raw data for this time period include the eight targeted LEAs whose identification policies, procedures and practices were reviewed for inappropriate identification of students in specific disability groups. None was identified as having inappropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. (0 divided by 8 = 0%)

Discussion of Baseline Data: Refer also to discussion of Indicator 9.

The following table shows four-year trend data for risk ratios across the identified disabilities, ages 6-21. Initial evaluations and classifications of Black and White students in all categories show fluctuations, but through the course of 4 years there are increasing or decreasing risk ratios from 2003-2004 to 2006-2007 in directions approaching 1.0, except in the classification Other Health Impairment. Though it is difficult to attribute this movement toward 1.0 to any particular improvement effort, it is a positive outcome for Louisiana's two predominant racial/ethnic groups. LDOE staff is

analyzing state guidelines for classifying students as Other Health Impaired in order to move toward 1.0 representation in this category, as well.

Table 10.1 Initial Evaluation and Risk Ratio- All Disabilities 6-21

	Black	White	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic
<u>Autism</u>					
2003-2004	.69	1.44	0	1.43	1.02
2004-2005	.65	1.66	0	Cell <10	0
2005-2006	.90	.99	0	0	Cell<10
2006-2007	.82	1.28	.13	1.41	.47
<u>Emotional Disturbance</u>					
2003-2004	2.00	.53	0	0	.73
2004-2005	1.98	.56	0	0	.78
2005-2006	1.87	.60	0	0	.63
2006-2007	1.87	.60	.72	.08	.38
<u>Mental Disability</u>					
2003-2004	3.97	.25	.36	.57	.82
2004-2005	2.71	.36	1.22	.71	.91
2005-2006	3.28	.32	.95	.27	.63
2006-2007	2.41	.46	.72	.23	.27
<u>Other Health Impairment</u>					
2003-2004	.72	1.45	1.07	.31	.81
2004-2005	.79	1.41	.82	0	.42
2005-2006	.83	1.27	1.46	.18	.69
2006-2007	.69	1.61	.63	.19	.44
<u>Specific Learning</u>					

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<u>Disability</u>					
2003-2004	1.66	.62	1.27	.20	.95
2004-2005	1.63	.64	1.15	.13	.99
2005-2006	1.54	.67	.77	.13	1.24
2006-2007	1.58	.68	1.27	.17	.54
<u>Speech/Language Impairment</u>					
2003-2004	.65	1.45	1.29	1.00	1.44
2004-2005	.57	1.68	.88	.91	1.38
2005-2006	.61	1.66	1.07	.75	.84
2006-2007	.76	1.36	1.12	.59	.78

Source: Based on Dec. 1, IDEA Part B, 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	0%
2006 (2006-2007)	0%
2007 (2007-2008)	0%
2008 (2008-2009)	0%
2009 (2009-2010)	0%
2010 (2010-2011)	0%
2011	0%

(2011-2012)	
2012 (2012-2013)	0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 9 for a complete listing of improvement activities to address disproportionate identification.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator area for FFY 2004, and baseline data are being reported for FFY 2005.

Each local education agency (LEA) employs at least one electronic data entry person who is responsible for entering all evaluation data. The data submitted include student demographic profiles, evaluation activities, pre-referral actions (School Building Level Committee), and other information, such as the reason for referral for evaluation. Timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed *Parental Consent-to-Evaluate* form, and a calendar is generated that allows for calculations of 30-, 45- and 60-day intervals. The electronic database has a series of system edits that aid in ensuring data accuracy. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored. To avoid duplicate entries, information is compared to ensure accuracy.

The electronic system calculates the end date by which each evaluation must be completed. Reports are generated monthly to ensure the maintenance of high levels of compliance. Monthly evaluation timeline reports show LEAs completing evaluations within 60 business days, as well as LEAs requiring extensions. The monthly evaluation timeline reports are compiled in one statewide report and reviewed by staff within the LDOE. LEAs not meeting the 100% compliance rate for the month are contacted to determine the reason for noncompliance. When an LEA has been out of compliance with timelines for three consecutive months, a technical assistance (TA) visit to the district is arranged. When noncompliance continues after the TA visit, the district must provide a written, detailed corrective action plan to address the noncompliance.

LEAs are allowed to take extensions of no more than 30 business days for 1) allowing an intervention process to be extended, 2) illness of a student, 3) illness of a student's family member, 4) illness of pupil appraisal staff working with a student, 5) unusual circumstances that interrupt the completion of the individual evaluation, or if 6) the student has received an individual evaluation within 3 years, but the report was not received by the LEA's Pupil Appraisal Department. Extensions up to 60 days are allowed for 1) LEAs awaiting receipt of specialized diagnostic assessment and/or medical assessment services not available in the school system, but which are necessary for the completion of the individual evaluation and 2) for natural disasters or catastrophes which may also cause interruptions in the completion of evaluations. The issue of obtaining parental permission and the evaluation timelines, including extension criteria, are stated in *Bulletins 1706* and *1508*.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or state-established timeline) was 100%.

Discussion of Baseline Data: Based on review and analysis of the baseline data collected for FFY 2005, all LEA districts within Louisiana were successful in completing initial evaluations within state-established timelines. However, LEAs exercise the option of taking extensions frequently, and LDOE wants to reduce that practice.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 11.1	Timelines	Resources
Reduce the number and length of extensions allowed on initial evaluations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze data regarding the frequency, length and types of extensions taken by LEAs. 	FFY 2006 – FFY 2012 FFY 2006 – FFY 2007	LDOE Staff State Focus Groups

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In consultation with State Focus Groups, prioritize the types of extensions that will be targeted for reduction and possible elimination. Rank extensions based on frequency of use. Provide professional development to those LEAs that use frequent extensions. Review monthly SER reports for indications that there are decreases in the use of extensions in those districts where professional development was conducted. Provide follow-up professional development if guidelines for the appropriate use of extensions are not followed. 	<p>FFY 2007 – FFY 2008</p> <p>FFY 2008 – FFY 2009</p>	<p>Monthly Special Education Reports</p>
<p>Improvement Activities 11.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>LDOE Pupil Appraisal staff and State Focus Groups will review data collected for SPP Indicator 12 regarding completion of evaluations of children served in Part C and referred to Part B.</p> <p>LDOE Pupil Appraisal staff and State Focus Groups will develop suggestions for providing technical assistance to districts addressing the timely completion of evaluations of children served in Part C and referred to Part B.</p> <p>Note: Completion of evaluations in a timely manner will help address the development of IEPs prior to 3rd birthdays.</p>	<p>FFY 2006 – FFY 2007</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>State Focus Groups</p> <p>Monthly Special Education Reports</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>In-service of Pupil Appraisal personnel across the State regarding the changes that will occur in 2009 eliminating all extensions, with the exception of end-of-the-school year and parentally approved extensions.</p>	<p>FFY 2008</p>	<p>LDOE Pupil Appraisal staff; District Pupil Appraisal Staff</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.4</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Once <i>Bulletin 1508</i> becomes law, LDOE personnel will begin tracking cases where the parentally approved extensions are taken by districts.</p>	<p>FFY 2008</p>	<p>LDOE Personnel, Data Managers</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.5</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>

<p>Each LEA will be reminded by the LDOE data division to run compliance report regarding the timely completion of initial evaluations. Each LEA will be reminded to check for accuracy and, based on the result of the report, address any non-compliant issues.</p>	<p>FFY 2009</p>	<p>The SER data system</p>
<p>Improvement Activities 11.6</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Continue to reduce the number of extensions allowed on initial evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review quarterly SER reports for indications that there are decreases in the use of extensions in those districts where professional development was conducted. Provide follow-up professional development if guidelines for the appropriate use of extensions are not followed. • Phone calls to district pupil appraisal coordinators. 	<p>FFY 2009 – FFY 2010</p>	<p>LDOE Staff Monthly Special Education Reports</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.7</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Each noncompliant LEA must submit a plan of action that will result in the LEA reporting to the LDOE the reasons for noncompliance, and the action to be taken to address the noncompliance the following year.</p>	<p>FFY 2010 – FFY 2012</p>	<p>LDOE Pupil Appraisal staff; District Pupil Appraisal Staff</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.8</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Review a number of initial evaluations. The review will include compliance indicators, as well as the use of best practices. Weakness in the evaluation procedures will also be noted.</p>	<p>FFY 2009 – 2012</p>	<p>LDOE Personnel, Data Managers</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 11.9</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>As new LEAs are established, an in-service will be offered to appropriate “district” personnel on the rules related to qualified examiners, timelines, and criteria for each exceptionality as detailed in Bulletin 1508.</p>	<p>FFY 2010 – FFY 2012</p>	<p>LDOE staff</p>
--	--------------------------------	-------------------

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were 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.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. 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)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The IDEA Part B Section 619 Coordinator and the IDEA Part C Director have met and developed a *Transition Fact Sheet* for distribution to Part C family service coordination agencies and Part B preschool and pupil appraisal personnel in LEAs. This document clearly outlines the responsibilities of Part C and Part B agencies in the smooth transition from Part C to Part B services for children. A meeting was held on August 9, 2005, with regional coordinators from Part C and Part B preschool programs to clarify their responsibilities resulting from the mandates of IDEA for ensuring a smooth and effective transition for all children found to be eligible for Part B preschool services at age three. Also discussed at the meeting was the revision of the *Early Childhood Transition Family Booklet*, which is distributed to families and informs them of the transition process from Part C to Part B. This booklet also informs families about important support services provided in Louisiana through the Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The 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 is 31.62%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Table 12.1

Comparison of IEP Dates and Birthdays
Students with Third Birthdays between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005
Data Source: LANSER, June 2005

	n	%
IEP by the 3rd Birthday	647	31.62%

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

IEP after 3rd Birthday	1399	68.38%
TOTAL	2046	

Data in Table 12.1 reflect information from the Louisiana Special Education Records (LANSER) obtained in June 2005. The data do not specify which children had previously received Part C services or if children had been referred after their third birthdays. The new data system, Special Education Records (SER), begun in August 2005, collects information which clarifies whether children had been receiving services in Part C and were transitioning to Part B.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 12.1	Timelines	Resources
12.1 A. Develop and conduct bi-annual informational	Nov. 2005	619 Early Childhood

<p>meetings with LEA Special Education Supervisors/Directors, LEA Preschool Coordinators, data entry personnel and Part C personnel. Reprint and distribute Transition Brochure at update meetings and upon request.</p> <p>12.1 B. Provide Q and A on transition from Part C to Part B at the 2008-2009 bi-annual informational meetings.</p> <p>12.1C. Review 2 year, 2 month, monthly report from OCDD/Early Steps of potential transition children and distribute to ECSE Regional Coordinators, ECSE Coordinators, and Special Education Supervisors/Directors. Collaborate with LEAs to ensure list is received from OCDD/Early Steps.</p> <p>12.1 D. Random monitoring of LEAs to ensure compliance in entering data into SER in timely manner.</p> <p>12.1E. Provide update of each LEA’s performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to Special Education Directors/Supervisors, including a quarterly report of children transitioning from Part C to Part B • Technical assistance report form to be completed and returned to LDOE, if needed <p>12.1 F. Revise and republish in English and Spanish the Early Childhood Transition Process Family Booklet to empower families to be engaged in their children’s educational decisions. Distribute to Special Education Preschool personnel, LDOE regional offices, EarlySteps personnel, Families Helping Families personnel, and Child Search Coordinators.</p> <p>12.1 G. Provide sessions on Supporting a Smooth and Effective Transition during the LDOE’s annual Preschool and Kindergarten Conference.</p>	<p>Discontinued</p> <p>FFY 2008 FFY 2009 FFY 2010</p> <p>Dec. 2005, Monthly thereafter</p> <p>Jan. 2006, Quarterly thereafter Revision 02/13 APR</p> <p>Nov. 2007, Quarterly thereafter</p> <p>Spring 2008</p> <p>January 2008 Discontinued</p>	<p>Special Education (ECSE) Team</p> <p>619 ECSE Team OCDD/EarlySteps OSEP conference call</p> <p>OCDD/EarlySteps 619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA preschool personnel</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA data entry personnel LEA preschool coordinator</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA Special Education National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center</p> <p>619 ECSE Team State Printing LDOE translation contractor</p> <p>LDOE Personnel</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 12.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>

<p>12.2 A. Conduct reviews and provide technical assistance to ensure data entry for students transitioning is occurring for students from Part C to Part B.</p> <p>12.2 D. Disseminate a Compliance Report and Plan of Action template to LEAs who exhibited noncompliance.</p> <p>12.2 E. Meet with stakeholders to review compliance with IDEA regulations; develop strategies to address noncompliant issues.</p>	<p>FFY 2005 – 2006 Quarterly thereafter Revision 02/13 APR</p> <p>August annually</p> <p>Fall 2008</p>	<p>619 ECSE Team, ECSE Regional Coordinators, OCDD/EarlySteps</p> <p>LDOE personnel, SER data personnel</p> <p>ECSE Transition Stakeholder Group</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 12.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>12.3 A. Develop and disseminate a question and answer document regarding transition issues</p> <p>12.3 B. Provide additional training to LEA Special Education Directors, Early Childhood Coordinators, district data entry person and LDOE regional staff regarding revisions to SER and proper data entry.</p>	<p>February 2010</p> <p>Spring 2010</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>LDOE Staff</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 12.4</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>12.4 A. Develop and disseminate a question and answer document regarding transition issues</p> <p>12.4 B. Provide additional training to LEA Special Education Directors, Early Childhood Coordinators, district data entry person and LDOE regional staff regarding revisions to SER and proper data entry.</p>	<p>February 2010</p> <p>Spring 2010 and as needed</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>LDOE Staff</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 12.5</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>12.8 A. Develop and disseminate a question and answer document regarding transition issues</p> <p>12.8 B. Provide additional training to LEA Special Education Directors, Early Childhood Coordinators, district data entry person and LDE regional staff regarding revisions to SER and proper data entry.</p>	<p>February 2010</p> <p>Spring 2010 and as needed</p>	<p>LDE Staff</p> <p>LDE Staff</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator area in FFY 2004, and baseline data are reported for FFY 2005.

OSEP determined in its 2001 Monitoring Report that statements of transition service needs and needed transition services were not being included on students' IEPs in Louisiana. In the FFY 2002 APR, Louisiana included monitoring data indicating that noncompliance in this area had been corrected in two of the five parishes monitored by OSEP: East Carroll and Rapides. Louisiana submitted further data and analysis indicating follow-up on noncompliance related to secondary transition in the three remaining parishes: Orleans, Jefferson and East Baton Rouge. After a review of records in December 2004, it was determined that 1) Orleans Parish had corrected the noncompliance; 2) Jefferson Parish had made significant improvements; and 3) progress made in East Baton Rouge Parish was tracked to ensure the corrective action plans were implemented and resulted in significant improvement in compliance. After reviewing records in June 2005, Orleans, Jefferson, and East Baton Rouge Parishes indicated full compliance with IDEA 1997's secondary transition requirements. For LEAs chosen for focus or random onsite monitoring visits, transition will be monitored.

Louisiana will be collecting data on this new monitoring indicator area for the first time through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) during the 2005-06 school year. (See Indicator 15 for a complete description of the Louisiana CIMP Process. Also, see Indicator 2: Improvement Activity 2.3). IEPs of students 16 years old and older will be reviewed, noting the number of students whose IEPs include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable them to meet their post-secondary goals. Onsite monitoring will continue to collect data to indicate the percentage of compliance for Indicator 13, with monitoring sites targeted and selected through FFY 2010 based on each district's transition and post-secondary outcomes until all LEAs have transition compliance data to report for this indicator.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005: The percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals is 31%.

Discussion of Baseline Data: LDOE conducted onsite visits to ten LEAs already chosen through the state’s general supervision system for Focused/Random Monitoring in order to determine compliance with this indicator. A compliance percentage was determined by reviewing the IEPs of transition-aged students using a comprehensive state-developed checklist, and by determining the authenticity of transition policies, procedures and practices through interviewing students, parents and school staff, and observing instructional settings. The standard set and reported for this indicator area required that IEPs include every one of more than 20 discreet transition and transition-related components to be judged coordinated, measurable and meeting post-secondary goals. The baseline data reported for Louisiana fall well below state and federal expectations of 100% compliance. It is also important to note that since LEAs in Louisiana are selected for focused monitoring for risk-based factors like low graduation rates, there is increased likelihood that there would also tend to be poor data in the area of adolescent transition programming in the LEAs selected for 2005-2006 onsite visits and reporting on this indicator.

In FFY 2006, LDOE changed the standards used by onsite monitors in collecting transition compliance data. Onsite monitors now use the Indicator #13 Transition Checklist designed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). Although the previous state-developed checklist comprehensively addressed lengthy, detailed and complex adolescent transition requirements, LDOE has opted to use the condensed list of components most closely linked with student outcomes in order to impact transition issues of greatest significance. The NSTTAC Indicator #13 Checklist, which is OSEP-approved and specifically designed to meet transition reporting requirements under IDEA 2004, meets the data collection requirements for both SPP and APR reporting.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 13.1	Timelines	Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Collect LEA data for annual evaluation to ensure appropriate transition services to students through the use of Indicate 13 NSTTAC Checklist approved by OSEP. ➤ Provide districts with the detailed list of documentation requirements for IEP submissions. ➤ The LDOE will develop an online resource for transition across the state. 	FFY 2006-2012	LDOE NSTTAC NPSO NDPC-SD
Improvement Activity 13.2	Timelines	Resources
<p>Targeted Technical Assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LEAs found to be noncompliant in the area of transition services will collaborate with LDOE staff to decide on a mutually agreed-upon course of action to correct noncompliance. ➤ Correction of noncompliance will be documented. 	FFY 2006-FFY 2012	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 13.3	Timelines	Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The LDOE will collaborate with various agencies to increase interagency collaboration and increase employment opportunities for transition aged youth. 	FFY 2008-2012	LDOE NSTTAC Regional Service Centers OCDD LRS
Improvement Activity 13.4	Timelines	Resources
<p>Conduct desk audits as a part of the monitoring process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide districts with a detailed list of documentation requirements for IEP submission ➤ Have districts provide documentation of self-review ➤ The DOE will develop an online resource for transition services in the state. 	2010-2012	LDOE LEA Staff

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Measurement:

<p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p>
--

<p>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.</p>
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator area in FFY 2004. Status data are reported for FFY 2005, and baseline data are reported for FFY 2006.

It was determined that the post-school data collection system would be incorporated within the re-design of the Louisiana Special Education Reporting System (LANSER). The new reporting system, called the Special Education Reporting System (SER), captures the data required to address Indicator 14. SER collects and sorts information entered by LEA personnel who are responsible for entering their district data.

For each student with disabilities who exits school in the 2005-2006 school year, each LEA is required to complete the initial exit section of Louisiana's *Post-School Transition Survey* in SER. Information from the initial exit session provides the LEA with specific student demographic information which will enable the LEA to contact the student in following years to collect survey data. LEAs will do follow-up surveys at one-year and three-year intervals.

Between April and September 2007, all LEAs will contact students with disabilities who exited for any reason during the 2005-2006 school year. LEA staff will complete the one-year follow-up *Post-School Transition Survey* data field in SER based upon the information provided to the LEA by the exited students.

In the collection of survey data, Louisiana has adopted the Rehabilitation Act's definition of *competitive employment*, which reads: *Competitive employment means work (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part-time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled.* [Authority: Sections 7(11) and 12(c) of the Act; 29 U.S.C. 705(11) and 709(c)]. The survey asks that students provide the number of hours worked per week, and Louisiana will report 35 or more hours per week as full-time employment and less than 35 hours per week as part-time employment.

The state's Transition Post-School Survey instrument defines *post-secondary school* as 1) four-year university, 2) community college, 3) vocational technical school, 4) military and 5) other specialized training. The survey does not request information on full- or part-time attendance, so responses will be counted for any amount of post-secondary participation in education or training.

Discussion of Status Data for FFY 2005:

Local education agencies have entered contact information into the Special Education Reporting System (SER) database on 4,878 of 5,187 students with disabilities who exited schools in Louisiana during the 2005-2006 school year. Of the 4,878 students with disabilities who exited, 2,068 dropped out and 1,312 received high school diplomas. This number represents a reporting rate of 94% on exiting students. Of the 309 students without contact information, 278 or 90% are dropouts.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006:

The percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school is 38.82%. Of the 3,302 students who completed the survey, 1,282 were competitively employed or were enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both. (1,282 divided by 3,302 X 100 = 38.82%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

LEAs were responsible for submitting follow-up data for 5,008 students who exited school in the 2005-2006 school year; LEAs received responses from 3,302 of those students. LEAs mailed out surveys and also conducted follow-up phone calls to assess postsecondary outcomes. The surveys' postsecondary outcomes included fields for employment, work environment, postsecondary training, living arrangements, recreation and leisure activities and adult agency support.

Feedback from LEA representatives responsible for collecting data indicates that there were several barriers to collecting post-school outcome data. First, during the 2005-2006 school year many districts had students who were hurricane evacuees living in temporary housing. Districts reported that they were unable to contact many of these dislocated students in the following year, since their contact information had changed. In the future, it is anticipated that this will not be a significant problem.

Another barrier to accessing information on student outcomes was the inability of LEAs to contact adult agencies in order to obtain information on former students; in these instances, interagency collaboration would have compromised the confidentiality of students' records.

A third additional deterrent to the collection of data was that families were often reluctant to respond to LEA questions about employment. Families were suspicious of how survey results might be used,

especially for individuals whose government benefits and support are subject to a myriad of complex employment regulations. Families were concerned that their answers to survey questions might jeopardize a family member’s government benefits.

Resetting of Baseline Data (FFY 2009)

Part B Indicator 14 has undergone significant changes this year. The State developed (a) a new baseline using the language of the revised measurement table (May 2010), (b) three, new measurable and rigorous targets, and (c) improvement activities. Louisiana calculates Indicator 14 data based on a census. For each student with disabilities who exited school in the 2008-2009 school year, the LEA completed an initial exit section of Louisiana’s *Post-School Transition Survey* in the Special Education Reporting System (SER). Information from the initial exit session provided the LEA with student demographic information that aims to enable the LEA to contact the student for one year follow-up data. Data are collected by district-level staff using a state-developed Post-School Follow-Up Survey. Students are contacted by mail and/or by phone and are asked to complete the survey. The state requires LEAs to make at least three attempts to reach former students. Data are entered in SER and a state level report is generated by the Data Management Office.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	40%
2008 (2008-2009)	42%
2009 (2009-2010)	44%
2010 (2010-2011)	A= 25.5% enrolled in higher education B= 55.5% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed C= 73.8% enrolled in higher education or in some postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment
2011 (2011-2012)	A= 25.7% enrolled in higher education B= 55.7% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed C= 74% enrolled in higher education or in some postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment
2012 (2012-2013)	A= 25.9% enrolled in higher education B= 55.9% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed C= 74.2% enrolled in higher education or in some postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 14.1	Timelines	Resources
Increase the number of agency linkages prior to the exit year *also see related improvement activities 13.3 and 13.4	FFY 2010-2012	DOE NPSO Louisiana Rehabilitation Services OCDD LAWIPA
Improvement Activity 14.2	Timelines	Resources
Conduct post-school follow up research with students and staff to obtain qualitative post school outcome data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present project results at local and national transition-related meetings. 	FFY 2006-2010 Completed	DOE University of New Orleans University of Louisiana Lafayette
Improvement Activity 14.3	Timelines	Resources
The LDOE will work with select districts to increase student access to postsecondary education and employment.	2011-2013	CCR Middle School Transition Staff University of Louisiana Lafayette Louisiana State University Human Development Center (LSU-HDC) Delgado Community College Bossier Parish Bossier Community College

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions, that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Louisiana Department of Education fulfills its general supervisory responsibilities through multiple activities that identify and correct noncompliance and provide technical assistance and training to ensure compliance with federal and state requirements.

As is discussed throughout this performance report, Louisiana is proud of its individual student data system that affords the LDOE the ability to conduct data reviews, examinations and data analysis. Using these data, the Department creates local education agency performance profiles that are used by the districts and the LDOE to determine district strengths and weaknesses and to plan program improvement activities and technical assistance needs. The data system is also a major source of information used in the state's onsite, focused monitoring process as sites are selected and priorities are established.

In addition, the information from the database affords the LDOE the opportunity to track evaluation and IEP timelines and updates. Monthly reports prepared for school districts allow them to use the information as planning documents for IEP meetings and evaluation scheduling.

The LDOE utilizes document review, examination and analysis to ensure compliance. In May 2005, the LDOE went live with an automated LEA application process for IDEA funds. Each local education agency is required to complete an online application in which the LEA uses data profiles to establish baselines and project targets on indicators established by the state for that year. LDOE personnel are able to access this online application to review and determine appropriate use of IDEA dollars, as well as to evaluate whether district targets are realistic.

In an effort to provide information, training and technical assistance, the LDOE has established eight regional education service centers throughout the state. Included among the staff at each service center are special education network specialists for pre-school and school-age programs. These specialist work proactively with the LEAs, supporting them through technical assistance and staff development. In addition, network teams at the LDOE provides technical assistance and staff development in all areas affecting students with disabilities to address noncompliant findings, as well as potentially noncompliant areas. Whenever feasible, staff development is coordinated with regular education programs and initiatives.

Special education issues and concerns are also addressed monthly with local education agency superintendents at Parish Superintendent Advisory Committee meetings. These meetings also offer opportunities for the state to explain its general supervisory functions and the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP).

The state has implemented focused monitoring as one part of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process. In this process, a group of stakeholders analyze state and district data and establish priorities most important for achieving improved results for children and youth with disabilities. Stakeholders then choose two to three areas of focus for selecting districts for onsite monitoring visits. Using data indicators which pertain to the areas of focus, school districts in the state are ranked according to their performance. Districts with the lowest rankings receive closer scrutiny through onsite visits and examination of complaint records and ultimately receive the necessary assistance to correct noncompliance.

To ensure a fair comparison among LEAs, Louisiana has stratified its 68 local education agencies into four population groups based upon the number of students served. Currently, Louisiana has increased the number of school districts collectively to approximately 166 school districts and charter schools. Within these four groups, districts are ranked according to how well they compare to the state average for each indicator that stakeholders have selected for focus; then, LEAs are ranked according to their deviation from the state average within their population group. In this way, two to three focus indicators have been used across the four groups to annually select districts for focused monitoring. During monitoring which follows the selection of districts, LDOE monitoring staff investigates LEA policies, procedures and practices, as well as any record of complaints, to uncover noncompliance impacting poor student outcomes in the area of focus.

Any noncompliance discovered is addressed by the LEA through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). A district must outline steps it will take to correct deficiencies and describe the timeline, personnel responsible and the evidence of compliance which it proposes. The LEA is required to collaborate with the LDOE in developing the Corrective Action Plan and must submit its CAP within thirty-five business days of receipt of the onsite summary of findings report. Upon receipt of findings, the LEA must immediately begin correcting noncompliance, and after the CAP's approval the LEA must meet all activity timelines, correcting all noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. The Division of NCLB and IDEA Support documents that all activities have been completed within stipulated timelines or provide written permission for extensions in cases of real hardship, such as the loss of documents during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in August and September 2005.

Creating an effective Corrective Action Plan is critical to the LEA effort. LDOE has provided assistance with this task by providing technical assistance in the construction of effective CAPs, which foster the change needed to impact student outcomes.

A follow-up is conducted to verify compliance prior to one year. LDOE monitoring staff conducts a follow-up to determine if there is continuing evidence of noncompliance in the areas where citations were issued. Further corrective actions on an accelerated timeline are required of districts with continuing evidence of noncompliance, and additional monitoring by LDOE may occur. In districts having significant difficulties achieving compliance through state technical assistance and training, the LDOE has required that IDEA funds be used to employ state-approved, outside consultants to assist in this task. Another sanction is the withholding of IDEA funds

LEAs not selected for monitoring are designated as being in *Continuous Improvement* and usually do not receive a compliance monitoring review during the year. When critical issues of noncompliance are identified by means other than the performance profiles (including, but not limited to, complaint logs, Part B State Performance Plan: 2005-2012

evaluation extension requests, and financial risk assessments), targeted, compliance monitoring may be required by the Louisiana Department of Education. Proactive measures of self-evaluation, support, and technical assistance are part of the monitoring process to ensure compliance with all regulatory requirements at the federal and state levels. Findings from data analysis, as well as findings from compliance monitoring, are used in allocating various LDOE resources for technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Louisiana's Department of Education general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no cases later than one year from identification, in 86% of the instances where findings of noncompliance are issued.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Louisiana collected and separated Measurements A, B and C for this indicator during FFY 2004. Federal baseline data reporting requirements are revised in the February 2007 SPP Template and require states to combine the number of identified findings reported for Measurements A, B and C. The new totals are then converted to the new percentage for baseline, which is reported above for FFY 2004.

In the data analysis which follows, Measurement A refers to noncompliance related to the monitoring priority areas in the SPP. Measurement B refers to other noncompliance not related to monitoring priority areas in the SPP. Measurement C refers to noncompliance identified through complaints, due process, hearings, mediations, etc.

Measurements A and B: The number of noncompliant findings reported in onsite monitoring reports sent to districts from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004 was counted according to criteria for Measurements A and B. Each finding of noncompliance was included either as a monitoring priority area and indicator (Measurement A) or other finding (Measurement B).

It was then determined if the activities in the districts' Corrective Action Plans were documented as being completed within one year of the issuance of the monitoring report for each finding. The reporting period for the successful documentation of correction of noncompliance is July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005.

The actual number of noncompliant findings related to monitoring priority areas was 79. The number of findings corrected within one year of the district's receiving the finding reports was 62, for a total of 78% compliance within a one-year time frame.

The actual number of noncompliant findings not related to monitoring priority areas was 39. The number of findings corrected within one year of the districts' receiving the finding reports was 31, for a total of 79% compliance within a one-year time frame. Noncompliant findings for Measurements B and the number of citations are grouped as follows:

- IEP Form and Content 15 Citations
- Procedural Safeguards 14 Citations
- LEA Policies/Procedures 3 Citations
- Professional Development 3 Citations
- Identifiable, Inferior Facilities 4 Citations

In Measurements A and B, noncompliance which was not corrected within one year was the result of Departmental policy, procedure, and practice regarding the CAP writing process. It was felt that serious, systemic noncompliance often required an extended CAP that would include continuing LDOE oversight, sometimes for as long as three years. In cases where focused monitoring pointed to poor performance

and poor data in selected districts, it was considered essential that data improve in order to demonstrate that substantial change had occurred. In effect, LEAs felt they had the latitude to take long-term corrective actions.

In the APR of March 2005, it was noted in remarks under Cluster I, General Supervision, that nearly all CAP activities in Louisiana were completed within a one-year time frame. Although this statement seems to conflict with Measurement A and B percentages submitted in this year's *State Performance Plan*, an explanation for this is that compliance data collected for 2004-2005 are measured differently. Previously, the time frame for correction began with the state's issuance to the LEA of an approved CAP. *Bulletin 1922*, which outlines Louisiana's monitoring process, instructed LEAs not to begin working toward the correction of noncompliance without a state-approved CAP. The CAP approval process, although designed to be collaborative, sometimes became too lengthy through this process of give-and-take and led to delay in correction.

The delay in beginning corrective action has been eliminated through revised language in *Bulletin 1922*, effective November 2005, which now states that LEAs must begin to correct known noncompliance immediately upon receipt of the state's *Summary of Findings*. Letters accompanying the state's *Summary of Findings* issued after September 2005 further direct LEAs to correct violations within prescribed time limits, which are delineated and in no cases exceed a one-year time frame.

Districts are instructed to submit their corrective action plans to the state within 35 business days. These CAPs are evaluated and revised by the state when necessary to maintain appropriate timelines and to ensure that activities address all noncompliant findings.

Measurement C: In the 2003-2004 reporting period, 16 districts had findings of noncompliance identified through the dispute resolution system, with 14 districts having findings in the area of FAPE in the LRE.

A total of 41 separate findings of noncompliance were identified in 2003-2004. There were 23 findings in the area of FAPE in the LRE, as follows:

- Failure to Implement IEP 6 Citations
- LRE 1 Citation
- Stay Put 1 Citation
- Suspension without services 2 Citations
- Failure to provide services 9 Citations
- No evaluation or untimely evaluation 3 Citations
- IEP Team 1 Citation

The remaining 18 findings of noncompliance were in the following areas:

- ESY 2 Citations
- Procedural Safeguards 11 Citations
- Confidentiality 1 Citation
- Behavior plans 2 Citations
- Transition 1 Citation
- Discriminatory grading policy 1 Citation

An additional 8 districts took some corrective action as a result of due process procedures through mediation agreements. No determination was made with regard to noncompliance in these cases.

Of the 41 findings of noncompliance identified in the 2003-04 year, all but one of the findings were completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date identified.

SPP Template – Part B (3)**Louisiana**
State

In this one state complaint, the LEA was found to have failed to provide special education services to a transfer student for approximately one month and was required to offer compensatory services. The LEA was also required to notify appropriate personnel of the necessity for compliance and to document the corrective action, which it failed to do. In response, the state will require the appearance of the LEA superintendent before the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in default of immediate receipt of documentation of compliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 15.1	Timelines	Resources
Improve self-assessment tools/documents/processes used by LEAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue developing new self-review documents as a component of the Monitoring Review Process 	2010-on-going Discontinued	LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 15.2	Timelines	Resources
Improvement Activity 15.2 LDOE revised <i>Bulletin 1922</i> , which outlines Louisiana’s <u>general supervision procedures</u> , to include appropriate guidelines for applying sanctions for noncompliance by LEAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evaluated the effectiveness of the sanction process by comparing SPP baseline data from the Dec. 2, 2005 submission with data collected under new procedures. ➤ Investigated LEA noncompliance that exceeds one-year timelines to determine causes. ➤ Included all monitoring activities (desk-audits, onsite monitoring, data review, etc.). ➤ Revise Bulletin to delete reference to LEA self-review data submission to LDOE until NCLB and IDEA monitoring process is combined. At that time, self-reviews will be required of all LEAs selected for onsite monitoring visits. ➤ Develop a monitoring manual to address the new desk top monitoring process. 	Revision 02/13 APR FFY 2010-2013 Ongoing Ongoing 2010/2011 2012-2014	IDEA 2004 Funding LDOE Staff LDOE Staff LDOE Staff LDOE Staff
Improvement Activity 15.3	Timelines	Resources
Provide technical assistance that fosters timely compliance. Train monitoring co-team leaders and peer team members to investigate noncompliance through the analysis of LEA data and focused onsite monitoring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Co-team leaders will plan onsite monitoring trips after collaborative analysis of LEA data profiles. ➤ Focused onsite monitoring will consider as priorities those compliance issues affecting student outcomes. ➤ Through desk audits or onsite monitoring, evaluate LEA compliance after CAPs are completed. Communicate with LEA personnel through quarterly update meetings, LEA committee meetings and LDOE regional coordinators concerning compliance standards and timelines.	Annual trainings FFY 2005-FFY 2010 FFY 2005-FFY 2010 FFY 2005-FFY 2010 FFY 2005	IDEA 2004 Funding LDOE Staff Contracted CIMP Trainer Contracted CIMP Monitoring Team Leaders Volunteer CIMP Peer

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>Provide annual training to LEAs on how to construct effective corrective action plans that meet compliance deadlines.</p> <p>LDOE will revise the LEA Performance Profile template as necessary to report to the public on those indicator areas where data are/will be reported for the SPP and succeeding APRs.</p> <p>Train monitoring staff and LEA self-assessment teams in utilizing Performance Profiles to analyze districts’ strengths and weaknesses and to assist in discovering noncompliance, particularly when it contributes to poor student outcomes.</p>	<p>FFY 2005- FFY 2010</p>	<p>Team Members</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 15.4</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>LDOE provides training to staff in the evaluation of LEA applications for observance of standards in the approval process to include appropriate funding and actions to identify and correct noncompliance identified through onsite, state-sponsored visits or the internal self-review process.</p> <p>Evaluate the effectiveness of training through a staff survey at the conclusion of the LEA application process and revise training as needed.</p> <p>Review training needs annually through the survey process and revise training as needed to encourage LEAs to address findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>FFY 2005</p> <p>FFY 2006</p> <p>FFY 2007, and ongoing</p>	<p>IDEA 2004 Funding</p> <p>LDOE Staff</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 15.5</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Establish an “SPP Oversight Committee” comprised of internal (across Divisions) personnel to coordinate the implementation of SPP activities across all indicators and ensure a coherent effort. This committee will evaluate the process and activities to ensure expected outcomes.</p>	<p>January 2006, and ongoing</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>Contracted Facilitator</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 15.6</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>LDOE has developed five network teams comprised of network specialist (which includes the formerly termed “special education regional coordinators”) to assist districts and individual schools in their assigned network by providing special education related information, trainings, and technical assistance.</p>	<p>FFY 2011 – Ongoing</p> <p>Revision 02/13 APR</p>	<p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>LDOE Staff</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Because of high illiteracy rates in Louisiana, oral complaints are accepted and treated the same as written, signed complaints. They are not distinguished in any way from written complaints and/or identified as such on the log. A written record of all complaints by parents, students, family members, and other advocates is kept on file at LDOE. Complaints are handled by one full-time and one half-time attorney on staff. All complaints are investigated, and written findings and decisions are provided to the parent and the LEA (non-parent complainants are informed that the matter has been investigated and closed), unless voluntarily withdrawn by the complainant or unless it is determined that the LDOE does not have jurisdiction over the complaint issue.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Of complaints with reports issued, 37% were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. There was only one extension granted.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A total of 46 complaints were logged during the period July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005; 15 resulted in findings; 14 resulted in no findings; 15 were withdrawn; and 2 are pending. Only 10 of the reports were issued within the 60-day timeline. Only one report was issued within extended timelines. The 37% rate is down from the 2003-2004 data, which indicated that 100% of complaint reports were issued within the 60-day timeline or extended timelines. This decline is the result of personnel issues, resulting from the transfer of a staff member and difficulty in filling the vacancy. The vacancy was filled, and LDOE recognized the need for support staff and assigned additional staff and support. As of September 26, 2005, one complaint was pending and one complaint was pending a due process hearing.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 16.1	Timelines	Resources
a. Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) <i>State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance</i> , in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	IDEA 2004 Funding LDOE Staff CADRE
b. Assign support staff for the logging, calendaring and filing of complaints. Establish back-up for complaint investigators.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	Regional Resource Centers
c. Establish a system of quarterly reviews to track any timeline failures.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	
Improvement Activities 16.2.	Timelines	Resources

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

<p>a. Appoint stakeholder/advisory council to identify areas of potential improvement in system operations in each dispute resolution area.</p> <p>b. Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) Dispute Resolution Systems Integration and Performance Enhancement: A Forum for the SERRC Region, 7 Pak States, and CADRE November 7-8, 2006.</p> <p>c. Provide training for potential state contractors for IEP facilitation as an earlier and additional method of alternative dispute resolution.</p> <p>d. Meet at least annually with stakeholders/advisory council to continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including Due Process hearings.</p>	<p>FFY 2006</p> <p>FFY 2006</p> <p>FFY 2006</p> <p>FFY 2006-FFY 2008</p>	<p>IDEA 2004 Funding</p> <p>Stakeholders/advisory council LDOE Staff</p> <p>Hearing Officers</p> <p>CADRE</p> <p>Regional Resource Centers</p>
<p>Improvement Activities 16.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>a. In conjunction with revising the State’s special education regulations, Louisiana has recently added an Early Resolution Process for our State complaints. The complaint investigator support staff revised procedures to reflect amended regulations, including the Early Resolution Process, ensuring that timelines are met.</p> <p>b. LDOE provided training for LEAs and parents on new complaint procedures, drafted model forms, updated the LDOE website, and provided assistance to LEAs & parents in implementing the new procedures.</p>	<p>2009</p> <p>2009-2010</p>	<p>LDOE Staff, Dispute Resolution Advisory council</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party, or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Requests for Due Process hearings are processed by LDOE staff attorneys and assigned to contract mediators and/or Hearing Officers. All hearing requests are assigned to a Hearing Officer for further action (most are resolved and do not result in a hearing and written decision).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of fully adjudicated Due Process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the Hearing Officer at the request of either party is 92%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The state received 70 requests for Due Process hearings between July 1, 2004, and June 30, 2005. Of these, 55 were resolved by mediation or were withdrawn or dismissed. A total of 15 cases were fully adjudicated, 7 within 45 days of receipt of the hearing and 7 within duly granted extensions. Only one of the 15 was reported late, and then by only one day. Fifty percent had one or more extensions. Most extension requests were joint requests, made with the agreement of both parties.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%

2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 17.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>a. Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.</p> <p>b. Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for Hearing Officers.</p> <p>c. Continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including Due Process hearings.</p> <p>(See also Indicator 16, Improvement Activity 16.1)</p>	<p>FFY 2005- FFY 2012</p> <p>FFY 2005- FFY 2012</p> <p>FFY 2005- FFY 2012</p>	<p>IDEA 2004 Funding</p> <p>LDOE Staff</p> <p>Hearing Officers</p> <p>CADRE</p> <p>Regional Resource Centers</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This was a new indicator area in FFY 2004 and is being reported for FFY 2005.

Requests for Due Process hearings are processed by LDOE staff attorneys and assigned to contract mediators and Hearing Officers. All hearing requests are assigned to a Hearing Officer for further action (most are resolved and do not result in a hearing and written decision).

As part of the dispute resolution process, LDOE has implemented the resolution session, which is now required, unless mediation is opted for both parties agree in writing to waive this meeting. The log of all complaints, mediation, and Due Process hearing requests will also track the number of resolution sessions held and those ending in final resolution by agreement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements was 60%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The following describes the activities and LDOE actions during FFY 2005 which account for the baseline data percentage:

- A total of 36 requests for Due Process hearings were received between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006.
- In 10 of the 36 requests for Due Process hearings, a resolution meeting was conducted.
- In 6 of these 10 requests for Due Process hearings, the results were settlement agreements.
- In 6 of 36 requests for Due Process hearings, mediations were opted for over resolution sessions.
- Of the 6 mediations conducted, 5 resulted in settlement agreements.

Electing resolution sessions is a new option for parents, and it will require time for all parties in disputes to become aware of this choice. As the successes of resolution settlement agreements are reported, it is expected that more families will choose this option. Louisiana’s improvement activities involving stakeholders and training for LEAs should impact this indicator area.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	75%

2006 (2006-2007)	75%
2007 (2007-2008)	75%
2008 (2008-2009)	75%
2009 (2009-2010)	75%
2010 (2010-2011)	75%
2011 (2011-2012)	75%
2012 (2012-2013)	75%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 18.1	Timelines	Resources
a. Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for LEAs on resolution session	FFY 2010-2013	IDEA 2004 Funding
b. Meet at least annually with stakeholders/advisory council to continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including due process hearings.	FFY 2010-2013	Stakeholders/advisory council LDOE Staff
c. Provide training for potential state contractors for IEP facilitation as an earlier and additional method of alternative dispute resolution.		Hearing Officers CADRE
d. Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for LEAs on resolution session.	FFY 2006	Regional Resource Centers
e. Meet at least annually with stakeholders/advisory council to continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including Due Process hearings.	FFY 2006-FFY 2012 FFY 2006-	

f. Establish mechanism for evaluating the timelines of the dispute resolution system.	FFY 2012	
	FFY 2006	

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Requests for Due Process hearings and mediations are processed by LDOE staff attorneys and assigned to contract mediators, and/or Hearing Officers. Mediation requests are available in connection with requests for Due Process, state complaint procedures or alone. When a mediation request is made, LDOE legal staff contacts the other party to ensure that mediation is voluntary on both sides and assigns a mediator if both sides agree to mediate. Parties to a Due Process hearing request may now opt for mediation in lieu of the resolution session and may continue the state complaint in order to mediate. The complaint, mediation, and Due Process hearing request log will now track the number of resolution sessions and the number of mediations held, as well as those ending in final resolution by agreement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of mediations held resulting in mediation agreements was 88%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A total of 88% of all mediated matters ended in a mediation agreement, and 93% of all mediations related to a Due Process request ended in a mediation agreement. Of all mediated matters, 75% not related to a Due Process request ended in a mediation agreement. The resolution session provides an alternate method of dispute resolution other than full adjudication.

Louisiana’s goal is to establish an optimum percentage rate for this goal by participation in the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Education (CADRE) *State Needs Assessment*. Meanwhile, using the range suggested by the United States Office of Special Education Programs, Louisiana’s goal is to reach resolution in 82% of all matters mediated either through the mediation or resolution session procedures or other alternative dispute resolution processes, without the costs and time delays attendant to the adjudication process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	82%
2006 (2006-2007)	82%

2007 (2007-2008)	82%
2008 (2008-2009)	82%
2009 (2009-2010)	82%
2010 (2010-2011)	82%
2011 (2011-2012)	82%
2012 (2012-2013)	82%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 19.1	Timelines	Resources
a. Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) <i>State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance</i> in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	IDEA 2004 Funding LDOE Staff
b. Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for mediators.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	Mediators CADRE
c. Continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including Due Process hearings, state complaint systems, mediations, and resolution sessions and their interrelationship.	FFY 2005- FFY 2012	Regional Resource Centers
d. Develop a system of IEP Facilitation to reduce the number of disputes in LEAs.	FFY 2006- FFY 2012	

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

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

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Special Education Reporting (SER) system replaced Louisiana's Special Education system (LANSER) in September 2005. SER is a web-based system that captures student-level data. Data collected include student demographic/profile, evaluation, pre-referral, evaluation, IEP services, exit and post-school transition data. The system is available continuously through the Internet. LEAs have the option of entering data as they occur through multiple means of submission (e.g., online, batch files or XML). Data entry is required during the monthly evaluation compliance and the yearly child count processes. SER data are used to determine evaluation compliance and are also used in the monitoring process. In addition, SER data are used to create a state audit database which is used by our state audit team in determining state funding. Special education data are also exported to our *Annual School Report* system (ASR), which determines school approval.

IDEA Child Count, FAPE and Exit Data: State and Federal Special Education IDEA Child Count, FAPE and Exit data are collected through SER. LEAs enter student-level data, and then data are processed to determine if students meet the federal and/or state requirements to be included in each Child, FAPE or Exit counts.

Discipline and Personnel Data: These data are collected via Excel spreadsheets. The LDOE is in the development process of modifying existing Louisiana data systems (Student – SIS and Personnel – PEP systems), in order to obtain these data.

The electronic database for student records (SIS – Student Information System) uses a number of processes to ensure that data are accurate. LEAs are provided with reports on a regular, scheduled basis, showing student updates and identification numbers changed, as well as reports for membership counts and enrollment counts (i.e., at the district and school levels). Additional reports are produced that highlight any deficiencies of suspicious/questionable data. Edits are also in place to prevent adding data that contradicts themselves.

Assessment data also are edited and processed to ensure accuracy. For example, sample scanning and test data files for three districts, and several special schools, are delivered to LDOE for review and approval before the contractor finalizes the state file. The predetermined file layout is included in the

delivery. These files are examined to make sure they meet the LDOE processing and scoring requirements. If the reports and/or the file do not meet LDOE requirements, corrections are made and samples sent to LDOE for further review and approval. Sample reports generated from the file are presented to LDOE for review. These reports are used to examine the scoring accuracy, processing logics, and reporting formats. No reports are sent to the users without LDOE sign-off.

Districts are allowed to clean up specific data elements through a web-based application. The before and after images of the full student file, as well as output from the clean-up application, are provided to LDOE. These files are compared against each other to ensure that the clean-up entries made by the districts were properly applied and no other changes were made. Additionally, the list of voided records is checked within the final Assessment file to ensure that only authorized voids were processed.

Also, the Assessment data are checked for consistency with the data from the electronic school and student databases. This process ensures that school data used in the Assessment file are valid and that student demographic data used in the Assessment file are consistent with those provided in the student database.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

State-reported data (618 and *State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report*) are 100% timely and accurate.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Measurement 20.a: Louisiana has been in compliance with reporting guidelines for the following five required tables:

- Table 1, IDEA Child Count due February 1st – submitted on time
- Table 2, Personnel due November 1st – submitted on time
- Table 3, Educational Environments due February 1st – submitted on time
- Table 4, Exiting due November 1st – submitted on time
- Table 5, Discipline due November 1st – submitted on time

Measurement 20.b: The state maintains accurate data through the following mechanisms:

The LDOE continues to ensure data are accurate through the following tasks:

- Annual LEA data management meeting
- Periodic system training
- LA Special Populations monitoring to ensure compliance with regulations
- Comparison of current year’s counts with previous year’s counts
- Data system edit checks
- SEA personnel attendance at the Westat (OSEP) Data Manager’s meetings
- Ongoing support to LEA personnel through help desk and website

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 20.1	Timelines	Resources
A) Conduct annual and on-going data management workshops for LEA Data Managers and SEA data management staff; materials and FAQs are posted via Blackboard as a reference resource.	April 2005, and Annually	IDEA 2004 Funding
B) Provide web-based trainings for new users of statewide web-based IEP and Special Education Reporting (SER).	2014 Continuously	LDOE Staff, Auditors
C) Conduct systematic data checks to ensure data are valid, reliable, and accurate; result is data free of error.	ongoing	Technical Assistance in Data Collection, Analysis, and Report Preparation
D) LEA superintendents must complete a Child Count data collection status form for each Child Count prior to the final count. This form provides the superintendent with the current and previous year's counts. In addition, the superintendent must indicate if his/her LEA will meet the Child Count deadline.	Discontinue	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
E) Manage and implement system updates to improve data quality and user experience	ongoing	Data
F) Two LDOE Systems Management staff provide Help Desk assistance to LEAs daily.	Sept.–Dec. Annually	
G) LDOE's Systems Management staff maintains a webpage within	Discontinued	

<p>blackboard for the SER system that contains the <i>System User Guide</i>, a calendar, a list of dates to remember, PowerPoint presentations, and the security form. The website and <i>System User Guide</i> are updated on as-needed basis. As the system is modified, the <i>User Guide</i> and website are updated.</p> <p>H) Meet with LDOE program staff to identify system modifications that would improve the Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4A) collections.</p>	<p>Discontinue</p>	<p>Community of Practice</p>
---	--------------------	------------------------------

Attachment #1 Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions and Due Process Hearings

Source: Data from 2004-2005

and Due Hearings	SECTION A: Signed, written complaints		Complaints Process
	(1) Signed, written complaints total	46	
	(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	28	
	(a) Reports with findings	14	
	(b) Reports within timeline	10	
	(c) Reports within extended timelines	1	
	(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	14	
	(1.3) Complaints pending	4	
	(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	2	
SECTION B: Mediation requests			
(2) Mediation requests total	31		
(2.1) Mediations	25		
(a) Mediations related to due process	17		
(i) Mediation agreements	16		
(b) Mediations not related to due process	8		
(i) Mediation agreements	6		
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	6		
SECTION C: Hearing requests			
(3) Hearing requests total	70		
(3.1) Resolution sessions	N/A		
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A		
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	15		
(a) Decisions within timeline	7		
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	7		
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	55		
SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)			
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	9		

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Louisiana
State

(4.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	5
(a) Change of placement ordered	1