2016-2017 State Performance Profile

LAUREL OAKS CHARTER SCHOOL

Total Public Population: 44

Louisiana's State Performance Plan (SPP)-Part B addresses reporting requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. The SPP sets annual targets for improvement in indicator areas determined to directly influence successful student outcomes. Further, the plan describes activities to achieve its targets, with annual reporting of the state's progress.

This Performance Profile is Louisiana's way of disseminating information to the public about the performance of local education agencies using Indicators in the SPP.

For the purposes of this report, general education includes all students - regular education (students without disabilities), students with disabilities, and gifted/talented. Special education refers to students with disabilities. A general explanation of the indicators is located at the end of this profile. Louisiana's State Performance Plan (with more detail about the indicators, annual targets, and activities designed to achieve these targets) can be downloaded at the following link: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics.

The Louisiana Department of Education has modified and/or suppressed data reported to protect the privacy of students in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) codified at 20 U.S.C. 1232g. The strategies used to protect privacy vary and may include rounding or other techniques but do not substantially affect the general usefulness of the data. Because of the privacy protections, numerical and percentage totals may not add precisely to the sum of the row or column to which the total refers. ~ indicates less than ten students in a subgroup and N/A indicates no data is available.

STUDENTS	STATE	DISTRICT
Students with Disabilities	11.7%	<5%
Gifted and Talented Students	<5%	<5%
Regular Education Students	≥80%	>95%

U Survey data are not reported, due to low response number

****** Counts too small to evaluate or data not reported due to low response number

***** This district was not monitored during the school year

GRADUATION WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA – INDICATOR 1 (COHORT GRADUATION RATE)

SPECIAL EDUCATION		GENERAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
STATE	DISTRICT	STATE	DISTRICT	
46.6%	N/A	77%	N/A	≥ 44%

DROPPING OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL – INDICATOR 2

SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
STATE	DISTRICT	
28.5%	N/A	≤ 30%

STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS (ALL TESTERS & ASSESSMENT TYPES) – INDICATORS 3B & 3C

PARTICIPATION RATE

GRADE LEVEL	MATH					ELA				
	SPECIAL EDUCATION		GENERAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET	SPECIAL EDUCATION		GENERAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	STATE	DISTRICT		STATE	DISTRICT	STATE	DISTRICT	
3rd Grade	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	≥ 98.8%	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	≥ 98.8%
4th Grade	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A		>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	
5th Grade	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A		>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	
6th Grade	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A		>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	
7th Grade	>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A		>99%	N/A	>99%	N/A	
8th Grade	98.8%	N/A	>99%	N/A		98.9%	N/A	>99%	N/A	
10th Grade	95.4%	N/A	97.5%	N/A		95.7%	N/A	97.7%	N/A	
Total Participation Rate	**98.8%**	**N/A**	**>99%**	**N/A**		**98.9%**	**N/A**	**>99%**	**N/A**	

PROFICIENCY RATE

GRADE LEVEL	MATH					ELA				
	SPECIAL EDUCATION		GENERAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET	SPECIAL EDUCATION		GENERAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	STATE	DISTRICT		STATE	DISTRICT	STATE	DISTRICT	
3rd Grade	47.4%	N/A	70.7%	N/A	≥ **39.7%**	46.4%	N/A	69%	N/A	≥ **39%**
4th Grade	45%	N/A	69%	N/A		48.3%	N/A	73%	N/A	
5th Grade	36.7%	N/A	64.5%	N/A		38.5%	N/A	72.7%	N/A	
6th Grade	27.7%	N/A	57.2%	N/A		31%	N/A	65.2%	N/A	
7th Grade	28.3%	N/A	60.4%	N/A		32.6%	N/A	68%	N/A	
8th Grade	28%	N/A	56.5%	N/A		38.5%	N/A	71.6%	N/A	
10th Grade	33.4%	N/A	63%	N/A		31.9%	N/A	68.7%	N/A	
Total Proficiency Rate	**35.8%**	**N/A**	**63.2%**	**N/A**		**38.7%**	**N/A**	**69.8%**	**N/A**	

DISCIPLINE (GREATER THAN 10 DAYS) – INDICATORS 4A	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
4A – A significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		No	no

DISCIPLINE (GREATER THAN 10 DAYS) – INDICATOR 4B	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
4B – Is the significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs **the result of inappropriate policies/practices/ procedures?**		No	no

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT (AGES 6-21) – INDICATOR 5	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day	60.7%	N/A	≥ **63%**
Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day	14.7%	N/A	≤ **13.6%**
Served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements	≤1.3%	N/A	≤ **1.3%**

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT (AGES 3-5) – INDICATOR 6	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	21.2%	N/A	≥ **27%**
Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	≤3%	N/A	≤ **3%**

OUTCOMES FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN WITH IEPS – INDICATOR 7	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited:			
Positive social-emotional skills	72.9%	N/A	≥ **71.5%**
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	73.1%	N/A	≥ **72.5%**
Appropriate behaviors to meet needs	76%	N/A	≥ **75.5%**
Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited:			
Positive social-emotional skills	63.7%	N/A	≥ **65.5%**
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	56.4%	N/A	≥ **58.5%**
Appropriate behaviors to meet needs	67.3%	N/A	≥ **70.5%**

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT – INDICATOR 8	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Percent of parents reporting that schools facilitated involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	85.38%	N/A	≥ **81.5%**

DISPROPORTIONALITY – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (AGES 6-21) – INDICATOR 9	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Is the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services **the result of inappropriate identification?**		No	no

DISPROPORTIONALITY – DISABILITY CATEGORY (AGES 6-21) – INDICATOR 10	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Is the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories **the result of inappropriate identification?**		No	no

EVALUATION TIMELINES – INDICATOR 11	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Initial evaluations completed in timelines	98.7%	>99%	**100%**

EFFECTIVE TRANSITION – INDICATORS 12, 13, 14	SPECIAL EDUCATION		2016-2017 STATE TARGET
	STATE	DISTRICT	
Students 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 birthday	97.1%	N/A	**100%**
Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals	100%	N/A	**100%**
Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were:			
Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	39.5%	N/A	≥ **35%**
Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	75%	N/A	≥ **79%**
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	87.2%	N/A	≥ **92%**

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN INDICATORS

1. **Graduation with a High School Diploma** – percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma (using a cohort graduation rate). The cohort graduation rate is a measure based on the percentage of students who enter the ninth grade and graduate four years later. This metric is a lag indicator, meaning that data is one-year older than the SY under review.
   Data Source: SIS, cohort graduation rate (post-appeals)
2. **Dropping Out of High School** – percent of youth with disabilities aged 14-21 exiting special education by dropping out. This metric is a lag indicator, meaning that data is one-year older than the SY under review.
   Data Source: SER, IDEA exit count
3. **Statewide Assessment Participation and Performance**
   a. **Participation on Statewide Assessment** – number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with/without accommodations, alternate assessment against modified standards, and alternate assessment against alternate standards (grades 3-10).
   b. **Performance on Statewide Assessment** – number of children with IEPs who are proficient as measured by the regular assessment with/without accommodations, alternate assessment against modified standards, and alternate assessment against alternate standards (grades 3-10).
   Data Source: Assessment data from Spring test results. Proficient is a score of Basic or above for statewide assessments, and Meets Standards or above for LAA1.
4. **Suspensions/Expulsions (greater than 10 days)** – number of students with disabilities aged 3-21 with out-of-school suspension/expulsions totaling more than 10 days. For this indicator, districts are compared to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension/expulsions
   a. **Out-of-school suspension/expulsions totaling more than 10 days in a school year** – a significant discrepancy occurs if the rate of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days is greater than or equal to 1.5 times the state average, not to exceed 3%.
   b. **Out-of-school suspension/expulsions totaling more than 10 days in a school year by race/ethnicity** – a significant discrepancy occurs if the rate of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days by race/ethnicity is greater than or equal to 1.5 times the state average, not to exceed 3%. This metric is a lag indicator, meaning that data is one-year older than the SY under review.
   Data Source: Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal, Section A, Column 3B. Note: Out-of-school suspensions and expulsions include suspensions and expulsions to an alternate site.
5. **Educational Environment (ages 6-21)** – Percent of students with IEPs ages 6-21 who are being served:
   a. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day
   b. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day
   c. In separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements
   Data Source: IDEA Data Tables (excluding nonpublic)
6. **Educational Environment (ages 3-5)** – percent of preschool children with IEPs ages 3-5 who are:
   a. Attending a regular early childhood program
   b. Attending separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility
   Data Source: IDEA Data Tables (excluding nonpublic)
7. **Outcomes for Preschool Children with IEPs** – percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved
   a. Positive social-emotional skills
   b. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills
   c. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. In order to assess improvement, children are tested upon entry and exit of their preschool program
   D*ata Source: Child Outcome Data collected and reported by LEAs using the Assessment Evaluation and Programming System interactive (AEPSi) by Brookes Publishing Company.*
8. **Parental Involvement** – based on a survey of parents' overall impression of whether schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
   Data Source: LDOE Parent Survey
9. **Disproportionate representation in special education** – Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. For this indicator, LEAs with risk ratios greater than or equal to 2.0 with a group size of at least 25 are monitored further to determine if the identification is inappropriate.
   Data Source: Monitoring/review results
10. **Disproportionate representation by exceptionality** – Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. For this indicator, LEAs with risk ratios greater than or equal to 2.0 with a group size of at least 25 are monitored further to determine if the identification is inappropriate.
    Data Source: Monitoring/review results
11. **Evaluation Timelines** – Percent of students who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the initial evaluation.
    Data Source: SER, Evaluation Compliance Statewide Summary Report
12. **Transition from Part C** – Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
    Data Source: SER, Part C Transition Report
13. **Effective Transition** – For youth aged 16 and above, the percent of IEPs that show the inclusion of coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable students to meet their post-secondary goals.
    Data Source: SER, Post School Transition Report
14. **Effective Transition** – based on a survey of students with disabilities 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.
    Data Source: Districts collect post school data through phone or mail surveys