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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

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

187

**General Supervision System:**

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

MONITORING  
  
The Louisiana Department of Education, LDOE, recognizes its duty as a state education agency to ensure statutory and regulatory requirements related to federal education programs are followed and program activities, supports, and services are achieving intended outcomes. The LDOE, Office of Statewide Monitoring, monitors the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B programs. The LDOE’s monitoring process is a model of Continuous Improvement Monitoring. The process includes a tiered system of ranking using a risk-based selection process, and more diverse, meaningful monitoring experiences. Through this process, LDOE can uncover the root cause for systemic issues of non-compliance.  
  
The risk-based process evaluates every school system every year for monitoring support. Risk indicators are determined through annual consultation with stakeholders, experts, and LDOE staff who lead the State's academic planning, accountability, and program support structures. Factors considered during the monitoring selection process currently include a growth analysis component for subgroup performance on statewide assessments, graduate and dropout rates. Other factors considered during the monitoring selection process may include one or more of the following components: LEA Determinations, federally required compliance indicators, performance indicators, state complaints, fiscal audits, and/or other agency established goals and priorities such as those identified in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Results from the ranking process informs the level and type of monitoring which is most appropriate.  
  
The primary focus of the State’s monitoring activities are on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that Louisiana meets the program requirements under IDEA Part B, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. The risk-based monitoring structure co-exist alongside the required APR monitoring and reporting requirements. This data-driven differentiated system of monitoring help elevate and target areas that directly impact student performance and serves as a major component of the State’s overall General Supervision structure.  
  
DISPUTE RESOLUTION  
  
LDOE is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. Therefore, LDOE has developed several processes, including those described below, for resolving disagreements about the provision of a free appropriate public education, payment for services obtained, or a child's eligibility, evaluation, level of services, or placement.  
  
IEP FACILITATION  
IEP facilitation is available to parents and school systems. Typically, an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Facilitator is brought in when parents and school system staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school system can request IEP facilitation; however, since the process is voluntary, both sides must agree to participate. The process can be initiated by request to the Legal Division of the State Department of Education, and the service is provided at no cost to the parent or the school system.  
  
INFORMAL COMPLAINTS / EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS  
Parents of children with disabilities may file informal complaints. The implementation of the informal complaint/Early Resolution Process (ERP) draws on the traditional model of parents and school systems working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.  
  
FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION  
A parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written request with LDOE to begin a formal complaint investigation. Formal complaint investigation procedures are developed under the supervisory jurisdiction of the LDOE to address allegations that a school system is violating a requirement of Part B of the IDEA. The formal complaint investigation request is also limited by regulations to action(s) occurring within one year before the formal complaint was filed.  
  
MEDIATION  
Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school systems regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school systems may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.  
  
Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school systems with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation is a voluntary process, and all parties must agree to participate in order for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location that is convenient to the parties in the dispute. Mediation services are provided by LDOE at no cost to parents and school systems.  
  
A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The discussions in a mediation session are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent due process hearings or civil court proceedings. If the mediation process results in full or partial agreement, the mediator will prepare a written mediation agreement that must be signed by both parties. In addition to describing agreements made in the course of mediation, the mediation agreement will state that all discussions that occurred during the mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in a due process hearing or civil court proceeding. The signed agreement shall be legally binding on both parties and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.  
  
DUE PROCESS HEARING  
A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an administrative law judge (ALJ) to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school system regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability. Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school system may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability within one year of the date that the alleged action forming the basis of the hearing request was known or should have been known. This one-year limit does not apply if the parents were prevented from requesting the hearing because the school system specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school system withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).  
  
Once a request for a hearing is received, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an ALJ to the case, and he or she will be provided with a copy of the hearing request. Otherwise, the request remains confidential. The ALJ will then coordinate a prehearing conference to discuss the hearing process and establish a schedule for activities related to the hearing. Please see Introduction attachment for additional information.

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

LDOE employs two primary mechanisms to provide technical assistance that ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs: field support and planning resources.  
  
FIELD SUPPORT  
  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM   
The School Improvement Team is the primary support vehicle for school systems, providing immediate, differentiated, targeted assistance to school systems. The Team targets Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) schools, and the Team includes School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) who work collaboratively with school system leaders to draft cooperative agreements, analyze data, and determine the School Improvement Best Practice(s) that best meet the needs of school system, educators, and students. These leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their school systems and build upon those strengths to support implementation of the School Improvement Best Practices through collaboratively analyzing data, strengths and opportunities for growth, a school improvement plan, observations and reflective feedback. The School Improvement Best Practices strategy is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year. LDOE has partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to develop, implement, and support five School Improvement Best Practices. The five best practices are:   
  
-instructional leadership team support,  
-teacher collaboration support,  
-teaching standards support,  
-principal standards support, and   
-career pipeline support.  
  
158 school systems are currently receiving support with instructional leadership teams, and of those, 70 are also receiving support in teacher collaboration. Additionally, the SISS is the the school system's primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic questions—including IDEA-related questions, accommodating the needs of the school system.   
  
Teacher Leaders  
This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a three-day conference that kicks off instructional planning for the following school year; and 2) School Support Institutes - a training sequence during the school year to support school leadership teams in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. LDOE also expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.  
  
Teacher Leader Advisors  
Teacher Leader Advisors are a group of exceptionally talented group of educators who play an influential role in raising expectations for students and ensuring that fellow educators have access to high-quality instructional materials and resources, and curriculum-aligned professional development. Teacher Leader Advisors participate in the LDOE's instructional materials review and create tools for the Teacher Support Toolbox. Additionally, they develop and lead professional development for educators across the state.   
  
PLANNING RESOURCES  
  
LDOE provides school systems with robust, forward-focused assistance through a variety of planning resources. These include:  
  
1) School System Planning Framework - serves as the primary planning tool for school systems. The Framework includes the key priorities LDOE has established in partnership with school systems, and school systems should use this Framework to identify their own priorities for student improvement.  
  
2) Super App - is a new online application that communicates school system priorities for the next school year and consolidates the process for approval of formula and competitive funds.   
  
3) School System Planning Guide - provides crucial guidance on how a school system will build a plan and submit a Super App for formula and competitive funds to support that plan. This includes the additional resources needed to build a plan that aligns to priorities highlighted in the Framework.  
  
4) Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities - provides principals and school system leaders with resources to create strong support plans. It is organized around four proven strategies for improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities: 1) identify disabilities early and accurately, 2) provide high-quality instruction to ensure the achievement of ambitious IEP goals, 3) strengthen instruction with specialized supports and related services, and 4) coordinate effective transition planning and implementation.  
  
5) School System Planning Calls - scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the School System Planning Guide with school system planning teams. These calls provide continuous, ongoing support to LEA superintendents, as well as senior staff in technology, assessment and curriculum, and special education. During these calls, LDOE provides more in-depth support, fields questions in real time, and integrates high-priority policies and other topics. In FFY 2019, LDOE regularly integrated support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on the alternate assessment, Louisiana's Connector standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, high cost services, alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and other priorities.  
  
More information on LDOE’s School System Support Structure can be found on LDOE's website:   
  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/school-system-support-toolbox

**Professional Development System:**

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

EDUCATOR-FOCUSED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM  
  
LOUISIANA TEACHER LEADERS and TEACHER LEADER ADVISORS  
  
LDOE believes that those closest to students, educators and parents, are best positioned to support students and thus the implementation of the standards. Given this belief, LDOE invests in the Teacher Leaders initiative to provide educators with resources and training so that they can make local, empowered decisions to support their unique students.  
  
The Louisiana Teacher Leaders make up a group of over 6,000 outstanding educators from around the state who are focused on high expectations for students. This group was born out of three core beliefs: 1) those closest to students are best positioned to make instructional decisions, 2) the State has a role in providing resources and training directly to teachers, and 3) Teacher Leaders are a powerful voice in training fellow teachers.  
  
LDOE offers Teacher Leaders a blend of high-quality tools and resources along with in-person and virtual trainings to help them achieve ambitious results with their students.  
  
Teacher Support Toolbox provides educators with direct links to the tools and resources to continue raising the bar for students in Louisiana.   
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/teacher-support-toolbox  
  
Teacher Leader Library  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/louisiana-teacher-leaders   
  
School System Support Calendar, a supplement to the School System Planning Guide, provides the schedule of in-person trainings, virtual support, tools and resources, and communication streams designed to support educators as they establish high expectations for teaching and learning to ensure that every student succeeds.   
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/teacher-toolbox-resources/school-system-support-calendar.pdf?sfvrsn=112  
  
Teacher Leader Newsletter  
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfOZaIZLI80PZiGpayxJVpa7EAw7gDW1x9C6POnF\_--toCHzA/viewform  
  
Teacher Leader Summit is an annual event that brings together educators and content experts from across the state to share knowledge, learn new skills, and prepare for the upcoming school year. Educators have the opportunity to choose from a wide variety of sessions covering role-specific topics.  
  
CONTENT LEADER  
  
Content Leaders are local educators who have the knowledge, skills, and concrete resources to provide high-quality, content-rich, and curriculum specific professional development to new and current teachers in their school system. The Content Leader program builds on the success of the Teacher Leader project and has two main goals: 1) equip a cadre of talented educators with the knowledge and skills to coach and support other teachers within their  
schools and school systems, and 2) grow local leadership pipelines for schools and school systems by developing talented teachers within the system. The Content Leader role is also an important step in the leadership pipeline for talented local educators.  
https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/content-leader-training-application-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=eb7f9a1f\_4  
  
INTERVENTION CONTENT LEADER  
  
Expanding on Louisiana's Content Leader initiative, Intervention Content Leaders are educators with expertise in providing effective intervention for struggling students. The Intervention Content Leader program builds an understanding of how to best support struggling students through high-quality intervention that provides access to standards-aligned curriculum. The role of the Intervention Content Leader is to: 1) train teachers to use core instruction and intervention time ensuring all students can access a high quality curriculum, and 2) support school leadership to ensure all teachers in the school use effective intervention strategies.  
https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/professional-development/intervention-content-leader-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=4c1f911f\_6  
  
SCHOOL SUPPORT INSTITUTES  
  
School leadership teams play an important role in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. The School Support Institutes support school leadership to play this role. Each school system and school are assigned to a cohort geographically, and participants are asked to attend all three sessions of their assigned cohort. Participants can choose one of three pathways for the entire training sequence. School teams can choose different pathways for team members to attend or select one pathway to attend together.  
https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/school-redesign/2019-summit-school-support-institutes.pdf?sfvrsn=d1889c1f\_6  
  
SPED FELLOW ACADEMY  
  
The SPED Fellow Academy is a year-long, comprehensive development program for novice special education leaders across the state. The fellowship provides in-person training (currently virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic), coaching, and a community of practice that instills the knowledge and skills the next generation of leaders need to lead and sustain change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.   
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/students-with-disabilities/sped-fellow  
  
PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUCCESS GUIDE  
  
LDOE believes all students should spend the majority of their time reading, speaking, writing, and solving curriculum-based tasks. To be successful, students with disabilities often require additional support. They need educators equipped to deliver specialized supports to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities, and direct services from certified providers to accomplish specific goals outlined in a student’s individualized education program.  
  
The Partnerships for Success Guide provides school systems with a list of partners that can provide professional development to develop the capacity of educators to deliver specialized supports and organizations that can fulfill the direct service needs often required to support students with disabilities. When equipped with knowledge and strategies to deliver specialized support and direct services, school systems can more adequately address the unique needs of students with disabilities and ensure meaningful engagement in the classroom every day.  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/partnerships-for-success-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=3af99d1f\_2

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

7

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

Throughout 2020-2021 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input. Parent engagement mostly occurred via the following:  
  
Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)   
Teacher Leader Advisors  
Families Helping Families  
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council  
Statewide stakeholder engagement partnerships

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

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

The LDOE solicited feedback from the following groups to increase parent diversity:  
  
Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)   
Families Helping Families, Louisiana's parent centers   
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council  
  
Additionally, the LDOE used the School System Planning Monthly Calls and the Superintendent's Weekly Newsletter to promote and encourage relevant stakeholders to participate in implementation activities.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

Louisiana remains committed to a comprehensive vision for student success in our state with every child on track to a college degree or professional career. Since this year was also a target setting cycle, Louisiana began engaging stakeholders in the fall of 2021 at our Special Education Advisory Panel meetings and continued in the spring engaging other commissions and all stakeholders through our special education reporting and funding website:https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

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

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

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

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.  
  
The State did not provide verification that the attachment(s) it included in its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 76.45% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 42.00% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% |
| Data | 44.30% | 46.64% | 52.50% | 59.29% | 64.73% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 76.00% | 78.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 86.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 2,753 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 190 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 43 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 615 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,753 | 3,601 | 64.73% | 76.00% | 76.45% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

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

Students in Louisiana can pursue one of two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma. The TOPS University diploma pathway requires students to earn 24 credits and prepares them for four-year colleges and universities. The Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma pathway requires students to earn 23 credits and equips them with the skills and industry-valued credentials, or Industry Based Certifications (IBC), to move into a chosen industry after high school. Both options are available to students with IEPs.

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

YES

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

Students with IEPs have the option to pursue either the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech diploma. However, the April Dunn Act (2014) gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue a high school diploma by meeting graduation requirements through alternate means. The law can be implemented in compliance with federal and state law, provided that students remain able to access the traditional diploma and curriculum requirements, even as they use alternate means of demonstrating proficiency. Graduation requirements for April Dunn Act eligible students include the following:  
  
1) Meet all graduation requirements, which include earning all Carnegie units and statewide credentials for the diploma pathway they are pursuing and demonstrating proficiency in the courses assessed by the state assessment, LEAP 2025. If a student is unable to meet the state-established benchmarks - scoring proficient - on the LEAP 2025 assessment requirements through traditional means, the student can meet this requirement through an alternate means as determined by the IEP team.  
  
2) In addition to meeting IEP goals and objectives, students must meet at least one of three transition criteria to graduate. The criteria include: employment in inclusive integrated environments, demonstrating mastery of specific employability skills, and access to services not provided by the school, employment, or education options.

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 37.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 33.00% | 30.00% | 27.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% |
| Data | 28.03% | 28.54% | 24.31% | 20.58% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 20.00% | 18.00% | 16.00% | 14.00% | 12.00% | 10.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

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

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 2,753 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 190 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 43 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 615 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 615 | 3,601 |  | 20.00% | 17.08% | Met target | N/A |

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

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

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

NO

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

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

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

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% | 98.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 6,805 | 6,383 | 6,007 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,127 | 226 | 200 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,973 | 4,938 | 4,391 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 535 | 940 | 859 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 6,805 | 6,389 | 6,230 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,106 | 196 | 154 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,992 | 4,966 | 4,548 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 532 | 937 | 852 |

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6,635 | 6,805 |  | 98.80% | 97.50% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 6,104 | 6,383 |  | 98.80% | 95.63% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5,450 | 6,007 |  | 98.80% | 90.73% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6,630 | 6,805 |  | 98.80% | 97.43% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 6,099 | 6,389 |  | 98.80% | 95.46% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5,554 | 6,230 |  | 98.80% | 89.15% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.   
  
For Spring 2021 results, use the following link:  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2021.xlsx?sfvrsn=7cc26518\_2.   
  
For past assessment results, use the link below. The results are available under the Special Education Data section.   
https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding

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

Louisiana reports comprehensively on children with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and school system.   
  
Louisiana’s Spring 2021 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, school system, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.   
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2021-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=17826418\_4  
  
LDOE's “Measuring Results” and “Data Center” web links report on K-12 assessments, early childhood centers, and school and student results, including School and Center Report Cards, School and Center Performance Scores, and Closing the Equity Gap.  
Measuring Results homepage: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment  
Data Center: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center  
  
Furthermore, Louisiana has a webpage dedicated to special education reporting. This webpage includes Louisiana's "Special Education Data Profile", which consists of statewide assessment tables, including: 1) children with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and alternate (LEAP Connect) assessments, 2) children with disabilities who scored proficient on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) children with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LEAP Connect assessment. The webpage also includes each LEA's Performance Profile, which reports on the LEA's performance against the State's targets in the APR. The Special Education Reporting and Funding page is available at https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3A - Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

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

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 16.49% | 17.50% | 19.50% | 21.50% | 23.50% | 25.50% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 9.39% | 10.50% | 12.50% | 14.50% | 16.50% | 18.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 7.69% | 8.00% | 10.00% | 12.00% | 14.00% | 16.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 12.40% | 13.50% | 15.50% | 17.50% | 19.50% | 21.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 4.88% | 6.00% | 8.00% | 10.00% | 12.00% | 14.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 5.59% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% | 13.00% | 15.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,100 | 5,164 | 4,591 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 489 | 85 | 52 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 517 | 400 | 301 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,098 | 5,162 | 4,702 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 407 | 64 | 39 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 349 | 188 | 224 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,006 | 6,100 |  | 16.49% | 16.49% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 485 | 5,164 |  | 9.39% | 9.39% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 353 | 4,591 |  | 7.69% | 7.69% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 756 | 6,098 |  | 12.40% | 12.40% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 252 | 5,162 |  | 4.88% | 4.88% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 263 | 4,702 |  | 5.59% | 5.59% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.   
  
For Spring 2021 results, use the following link:  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2021.xlsx?sfvrsn=7cc26518\_2.   
  
For past assessment results, use the link below. The results are available under the Special Education Data section.   
https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding

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

FFY 2020 is the first year reporting this target and reporting ELA and math proficiency by grades 4, 8 and HS. Additionally, this is the first year that the State is defining proficiency as scoring Mastery+ instead of Basic+ on our statewide assessments. This is also the State's first set of statewide assessment data post-pandemic.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3B - Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

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

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 50.65% | 52.00% | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% | 60.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 56.70% | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 71.59% | 73.00% | 75.00% | 77.00% | 79.00% | 81.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 51.69% | 53.00% | 55.00% | 57.00% | 59.00% | 61.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 59.34% | 60.00% | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 49.65% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% | 57.00% | 59.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 535 | 940 | 859 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 271 | 533 | 615 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 532 | 937 | 852 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 275 | 556 | 423 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 271 | 535 |  | 50.65% | 50.65% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 533 | 940 |  | 56.70% | 56.70% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 615 | 859 |  | 71.59% | 71.59% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 275 | 532 |  | 51.69% | 51.69% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 556 | 937 |  | 59.34% | 59.34% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 423 | 852 |  | 49.65% | 49.65% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.   
  
For Spring 2021 results, use the following link:  
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternate-test-summary-2021.xlsx?sfvrsn=7cc26518\_2.   
  
For past assessment results, use the link below. The results are available under the Special Education Data section.   
https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding

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

FFY 2020 is the first year reporting this target and reporting ELA and math proficiency by grades 4, 8 and HS. Additionally, the State's alternate assessment has new achievement levels, where proficiency is defined as Near Goal or above. This is also our first set of statewide assessment data post-pandemic.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3C - Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

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

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 25.25 | 25.00 | 24.00 | 23.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 34.71 | 34.00 | 33.00 | 32.00 | 31.00 | 30.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 33.50 | 33.00 | 32.00 | 31.00 | 30.00 | 29.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 19.50 | 19.00 | 18.00 | 17.00 | 16.00 | 15.00 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 20.00 | 19.00 | 18.00 | 17.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 26.25 | 26.00 | 25.00 | 24.00 | 23.00 | 22.00 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 48,690 | 51,031 | 49,935 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,100 | 5,164 | 4,591 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 18,730 | 20,956 | 19,347 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,611 | 1,552 | 1,222 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 489 | 85 | 52 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 517 | 400 | 301 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 48,685 | 51,062 | 50,982 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,098 | 5,162 | 4,702 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 14,346 | 12,969 | 15,398 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,234 | 859 | 950 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 407 | 64 | 39 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 349 | 188 | 224 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 16.49% | 41.78% |  | 25.25 | 25.28 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9.39% | 44.11% |  | 34.71 | 34.71 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7.69% | 41.19% |  | 33.50 | 33.50 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 12.40% | 32.00% |  | 19.50 | 19.60 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 4.88% | 27.08% |  | 22.00 | 22.20 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5.59% | 32.07% |  | 26.25 | 26.47 | N/A | N/A |

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

FFY 2020 is the first year reporting this target and reporting ELA and math proficiency by grades 4, 8 and HS. Additionally, this is the first year that the State is defining proficiency as scoring Mastery+ instead of Basic+ on our statewide assessments.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 26.50% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 19.50% | 17.50% | 15.50% | 13.50% | 13.50% |
| Data | 14.91% | 19.02% | 18.50% | 19.78% | 11.92% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 13.50% | 13.50% | 13.00% | 12.50% | 12.50% | 12.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 14 | 191 | 11.92% | 13.50% | 7.33% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Louisiana has defined significant discrepancy as the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Since the State uses percentages, there is no minimum n-size. Thus, all LEAs were included in the calculation. For the FFY 2019 APR submission, the state average was 1.02%. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 1.02% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

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

The FFY 2020 APR generally reflects data from school year 2020-2021. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2019-2020.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

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

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:   
  
a. the LEA's code of conduct;   
b. the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;   
c. the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;   
d. the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;   
e. the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and   
f. the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.   
  
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.   
  
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.   
  
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA must: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.   
  
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this non-compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2020 APR, due February 1, 2021. The State DID NOT identify non-compliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

20

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 7 | 0 | 171 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Louisiana defines significant discrepancy as the percent of all students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days at a rate 1.5 times greater than the state average not to exceed 3%. To be considered for this indicator, an LEA must meet the State-established minimum N size of 25 and have at least 3 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered with disciplinary removals greater than 10 days. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was 1.02%. Thus, any LEA with a percentage greater than 1.02% for any racial/ethnic group who met the above criteria was considered significantly discrepant.

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

The FFY 2020 APR generally reflects data from school year 2020-2021. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2019-2020.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

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

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:   
  
a. the LEA's code of conduct;   
b. the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;   
c. the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;   
d. the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;   
e. the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and   
f. the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.   
  
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.   
  
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.   
  
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA must: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.   
  
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this non-compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2020 APR, due February 1, 2021. The State DID NOT identify non-compliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 62.50% | 63.00% | 63.50% | 64.00% | 64.00% |
| A | 71.98% | Data | 59.67% | 60.72% | 60.87% | 61.76% | 63.93% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 13.65% | 13.60% | 13.56% | 13.50% | 13.50% |
| B | 9.61% | Data | 13.91% | 14.71% | 14.66% | 14.59% | 14.00% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.30% | 1.30% | 1.30% | 1.30% | 1.30% |
| C | 1.29% | Data | 1.33% | 1.25% | 1.24% | 1.20% | 1.22% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 72.00% | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% |
| Target B <= | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.40% | 9.40% | 9.40% |
| Target C <= | 1.20% | 1.20% | 1.20% | 1.10% | 1.10% | 1.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 69,566 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 50,071 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 6,688 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 265 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 79 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 552 |

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 50,071 | 69,566 | 63.93% | 72.00% | 71.98% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 6,688 | 69,566 | 14.00% | 9.50% | 9.61% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 896 | 69,566 | 1.22% | 1.20% | 1.29% | N/A | N/A |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 27.00% | 27.00% | 30.00% | 31.00% | 31.00% |
| **A** | Data | 23.92% | 21.25% | 20.27% | 18.57% | 17.75% |
| **B** | Target <= | 3.00% | 3.00% | 2.90% | 2.90% | 2.90% |
| **B** | Data | 3.61% | 3.86% | 5.06% | 5.14% | 4.90% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 16.25% | 16.50% | 17.00% | 17.25% | 17.50% | 18.00% |
| Target B <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 4.90% | 4.90% | 4.80% | 4.80% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 3.34% | 3.34% | 3.20% | 3.20% | 3.10% | 3.10% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 1,322 | 2,964 | 4,096 | 8,382 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 91 | 602 | 666 | 1,359 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 107 | 207 | 155 | 469 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 4 | 3 | 6 | 13 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 153 | 85 | 42 | 280 |

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 1,359 | 8,382 | 17.75% | 16.25% | 16.21% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 484 | 8,382 | 4.90% | 5.00% | 5.77% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 280 | 8,382 |  | 3.34% | 3.34% | N/A | N/A |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for subindicators 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State has established the baseline for subindicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

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

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2010 | Target >= | 71.00% | 71.50% | 72.00% | 72.50% | 72.50% |
| A1 | 69.60% | Data | 72.59% | 72.90% | 71.37% | 68.52% | 68.11% |
| A2 | 2010 | Target >= | 65.00% | 65.50% | 66.00% | 66.50% | 66.50% |
| A2 | 64.90% | Data | 64.05% | 63.74% | 61.44% | 50.60% | 47.51% |
| B1 | 2010 | Target >= | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 73.50% |
| B1 | 70.90% | Data | 72.72% | 73.14% | 71.08% | 72.57% | 68.90% |
| B2 | 2010 | Target >= | 58.00% | 58.50% | 59.00% | 59.50% | 59.50% |
| B2 | 56.20% | Data | 57.77% | 56.37% | 55.00% | 55.25% | 45.99% |
| C1 | 2010 | Target >= | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% | 76.50% |
| C1 | 74.70% | Data | 75.11% | 75.96% | 74.69% | 59.09% | 54.70% |
| C2 | 2010 | Target >= | 70.00% | 70.50% | 71.00% | 71.50% | 71.50% |
| C2 | 69.00% | Data | 68.31% | 67.30% | 65.93% | 44.70% | 30.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 71.50% | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 65.00% | 65.20% | 65.40% | 65.60% | 65.80% | 66.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 72.00% | 72.00% | 72.50% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 57.00% | 57.20% | 57.40% | 57.60% | 57.80% | 58.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 60.00% | 60.25% | 60.50% | 60.75% | 70.00% | 70.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

2,091

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 237 | 11.33% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 298 | 14.25% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 537 | 25.68% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 662 | 31.66% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 357 | 17.07% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,199 | 1,734 | 68.11% | 71.50% | 69.15% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,019 | 2,091 | 47.51% | 65.00% | 48.73% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 270 | 12.91% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 347 | 16.59% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 505 | 24.15% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 724 | 34.62% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 245 | 11.72% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,229 | 1,846 | 68.90% | 72.00% | 66.58% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 969 | 2,091 | 45.99% | 57.00% | 46.34% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 318 | 15.21% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 453 | 21.66% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 664 | 31.76% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 502 | 24.01% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 154 | 7.36% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,166 | 1,937 | 54.70% | 72.50% | 60.20% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 656 | 2,091 | 30.79% | 60.00% | 31.37% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B1** | In an effort to streamline the use of a common assessment tool, all publicly funded early childhood programs transitioned from using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) to Teaching Strategies GOLD as the assessment tool to measure child outcomes for all children ages 3-5 with IEPs in FFY 18. The Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) provided all early childhood programs utilizing TS GOLD with the option to complete a default abbreviated version of the required item set, or 70% of the total objectives and dimensions, which requires the general early childhood TS GOLD license and the OSEP license to remain separate so that any child reported with an IEP is assessed using the complete item set, with the addition of objectives 1c1-1c4. All local networks were required to identify an OSEP Administrator in order to oversee and monitor the input of all entry and exit assessment data for any child with an IEP that must be entered into the OSEP specific license.   The monitoring and compliance of two separate licenses presented accountability challenges in the total number of children being reported, entry and exist submission timelines, and frequent turnover among the OSEP Administrator role. The LDOE developed significant field support resources during FFY 2019 to ensure new OSEP Administrators are meeting role and responsibility requirements. Furthermore, the LDOE recognized that the current systems for accountability and data quality needed additional support. Beginning in FFY 2021, the Department required a full item set completion for all early childhood TS GOLD licenses to streamline approaches to accountability and data quality for children ages 3-5 with disabilities. |

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

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

NO

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 39.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 38.00% | 81.50% | 82.50% | 83.50% | 83.50% |
| Data | 77.63% | 85.38% | 83.25% | 85.71% | 84.31% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 84.50% | 85.50% | 86.50% | 87.50% | 88.50% | 89.50% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 556 | | 640 | 84.31% | 84.50% | 86.88% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

LDOE uses a single parent involvement survey. LEAs disseminate the survey to parents of all children with disabilities, including preschool children. LDOE’s FFY 2020 data reflect both preschool and school age respondents. LDOE compares the response rate of parents of preschool children with the statewide percentage of preschool children with disabilities to ensure responses are valid and reliable. In FFY 2020, approximately 8.8% of survey respondents were parents of preschool students with disabilities, which is reflective of the statewide rate of 13.0%, ensuring valid and reliable results.

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

16,837

**Percentage of respondent parents**

3.80%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 2.44% | 3.80% |

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

Historically, Louisiana has reported low response rates for the special education parent involvement survey. For FFY 2020, the LDOE offered office hours to assist parents with completing the survey instead of the option to complete the online survey. While the survey was available online, LDOE understood the need to offer families another method besides completing the survey electronically. With this method, LDOE staff read the survey questions to the respondent, and the answers were recorded in the online survey. School systems were also provided with a QR code for the survey to share with parents. The QR code allowed parents to easily access the survey on a mobile device.   
  
To increase the response rate from FFY 2021 onward, the LDOE will promote the parent involvement survey by utilizing its Be Engaged Initiative. The Be Engaged Initiative is a statewide initiative to increase parent and family engagement in school systems. The initiative strives to bring awareness to the importance of parent and family engagement and to meaningfully engage stakeholders to gain input that drives initiatives. The LDOE uses PimsPoints, a system designed to support and ignite engagement. The special education parent involvement survey will be shared with participating school systems in PimsPoints, providing a new method for parents to complete the survey.

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

After review of the State's special education parent involvement survey, the LDOE concluded that the survey questions did not collect information to ensure the respondents are representative of the demographics of children receiving services. Thus, the State revised its special education parent involvement survey. For FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The parent survey considered the following categories:   
  
-race/ethnicity;  
-gender;  
-age;  
-geographic location (urban or rural).  
  
In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services. The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 48% Black or African-American, followed by 43% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%. The percent of students with disabilities in the remaining ethnic groups - Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or Two or More Races - are all less than 5%. The percent of respondents for each of these ethnic groups is less than 5%.   
  
The analysis did identify nonresponse bias for male respondents. The percent of male students with disabilities in Louisiana is 67%; the percent of female students with disabilities is 33%. Although the percent of male and female students with disabilities for whom parents responded is representative of the percent of male and female students in Louisiana (67% and 34%, respectively), the percent of female respondents was 92%; only 8% were male respondents. The LDOE will seek and implement strategies to reduce nonresponse bias for male respondents for future surveys.   
  
Please see Indicator 8 attachment for the FFY 2020 special education parent involvement survey.

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

For FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The parent survey considered the following categories:   
  
-race/ethnicity;  
-gender;  
-age;  
-geographic location (urban or rural).  
  
In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services. The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 48% Black or African -American, followed by 43% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%. The percent of students with disabilities in the remaining ethnic groups - Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or Two or More Races - are all less than 5%. The percent of respondents for each of these ethnic groups are less than 5%.

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

YES

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

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

For FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The responses were analyzed to determine representativeness.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

Louisiana serves over 118,000 students with disabilities, ages 3-21, in LEAs ranging in size from single school charter schools to districts with over 40,000 students. To reach this diverse range of school systems, schools, and students, LDOE developed a statistically valid sampling plan for the SPP/APR cycle. Louisiana uses a two-step process to develop the sampling plan for each SPP/APR cycle.  
  
Step 1: Louisiana stratified LEA selection based on a number of factors.  
  
The LDOE considers a number of variables to ensure that each year’s sample is representative of the state as a whole. The population is stratified into three groups: 1) traditional LEAs—include parish and city school districts and state special schools, 2) Type 2 charter schools, and 3) Type 5 charters and other non-traditional LEAs. Additionally, LEAs are stratified to ensure geographic (northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest) as well as urban, suburban, and rural representation across the state. The LDOE uses statistical software to randomly assign LEAs to a cohort.  
  
The LDOE conducts a series of additional analyses to ensure that the survey years contains a sample that will be representative of the state as a whole in disability, race, age and gender. Each year is found to be representative, ensuring a valid and reliable sample. OSEP requires that any LEA with an average daily membership of more than 50,000 students must be included in the sample each year. Since Louisiana does not have any LEAs that meet this criterion, each LEA will be included one time during the SPP/APR cycle.  
  
Step 2: Louisiana includes all students with disabilities in each selected LEA.  
  
In selected LEAs, each parent of a student with a disability will receive the Indicator 8 parent involvement survey. LDOE developed an electronic survey tool to administer the survey and letters to parents with access information. Furthermore, for FFY 2020, the LDOE provided LEAs with a QR code in addition to the survey letters for parents to better access the survey. Each LEA was required to disseminate letters along with the QR code to every parent of a student with a disability with a unique ID to access the electronic survey. This census approach, where every parent in the population is included for a complete count, means that LDOE will not use any other sampling of the population after Step 1. Using this approach, LDOE plans to reach each parent within the LEA.

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

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

After review of the State's special education parent involvement survey, the LDOE concluded that the survey questions did not collect information to ensure the respondents are representative of the demographics of children receiving services. Thus, the State revised its special education parent involvement survey. For FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. Please see Indicator 8 attachment for the FFY 2020 special education parent involvement survey.

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required.  
  
The State analyzed the response rate to identify potential non-response bias; however, the State did not identify steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities, as required by the Measurement Table.   
  
The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.  
  
The State did not provide verification that the attachment(s) it included in its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the metric used to determine representativeness and must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities and strategies to reduce nonresponse bias, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

18

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 30 | 0 | 169 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

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

YES

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

LDOE has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation based on one year of data. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE follows a two-step process.  
  
First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the FFY 2020 APR submission, LDOE used the October 1, 2020 Child Count Report to extract the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category. LDOE then completes a risk ratio analysis for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services, excluding any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 187 LEAs included in the analysis, LDOE identified 30 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.  
  
Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 30 LEAs to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification through policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric- a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students for special education and related services. The rubric includes topics such as professional development, teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All 30 LEAs completed the review; none of the LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

27

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 47 | 0 | 160 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

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

YES

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

LDOE has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation based on one year of data. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE uses the following protocol:  
  
First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in any of the following six specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2020 APR submission, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six specific disability categories was extracted from the state’s October 1, 2020 Child Count Report. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 187 LEAs, LDOE identified 47 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.  
  
Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 47 LEAs to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification of their policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric-a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying their practices, policies, and procedures that may have led to inappropriate identification of students based on their race or ethnicity, by disability. All 47 LEAs completed the review, and zero LEAs determined that the instance of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.37% | 98.69% | 98.59% | 99.13% | 98.01% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15,193 | 13,609 | 98.01% | 100% | 89.57% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

The primary reason for the 8.41% slippage in completing evaluations within the 60-day evaluation timeline was due to COVID 19 pandemic-which delayed LEAs from administering the necessary evaluation components due to school closures and staff shortages.

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

1,584

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

LDOE identified a total of 1584 children for whom parental consent was obtained, but from whom evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline is included below:  
  
(124) 1-15 days  
(53) 16-30 days  
(77) 31-45 days  
(248) 46-60 days  
(1082) 60+ days  
  
The majority of delayed evaluations were completed within 60+ days of the deadline. LEAs identified the following primary reasons for delay:  
  
-school closures  
-staff shortages  
-inaccurate data entry  
-miscalculation of evaluation dates  
-delayed reports of outside agencies  
-delayed receipt of medical documents

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The FFY 2020 Indicator 11 data was extracted from Louisiana's Special Education Reporting (SER) System. Evaluation timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed Parental Consent-to-Evaluate form. SER has a series of system checks that aid in ensuring data accuracy, including a Business Day calendar that may be generated for calculations of 45 and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.  
  
LDOE uses a standard process for data collection, determination of non-compliance, and issuance of findings:  
  
1. LDOE gathers data from SER after the end of the 2020-2021 school year.  
  
2. LDOE identifies LEAs who appear noncompliant and offers them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.  
  
3. LDOE identifies LEAs with cases of non-compliance.  
  
4. LDOE conducts outreach to LEA Special Education Directors, providing them with information on evaluations that exceeded the 60-day timelines in the absence of an approved extension.  
  
5. LEAs that were identified as non-compliant submit a plan of action that indicates the reason for the non-compliance, a description of what could have been done to keep the evaluation compliant, a list of actions taken to ensure non-compliance will not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.  
  
6. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after noncompliance is identified.  
  
7. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 247 | 247 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2019, LDOE reported findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are placed in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP includes activities that target the areas of noncompliance listed on the monitoring report. For each CAP activity, the LEA must submit a deliverable according to the timeline prescribed on the CAP. Each CAP activity is reviewed and feedback is given to the LEA as to whether or not the deliverable is sufficient to address the activity on the CAP. If the deliverable is not sufficient, the LEA is notified and they are directed to resubmit with the correct information. If the information submitted is sufficient, then the LEA is notified that the activity is complete for that particular activity and timeline. Once the LEA has been found to sufficiently have completed all activities on the CAP by the LDOE reviewer, the LEA is sent an email closing out the CAP. The LEA must also go through a follow-up monitoring (desk review or onsite) where new data is reviewed to see if systemic changes of compliance have occurred from prior monitoring.

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

LDOE verified that each individual case of non-compliance was corrected by requiring LEAs to submit and implement a CAP, which includes activities to ensure compliance, correction, and identification of practical methods to avoid slippage regarding evaluation timelines in the future. The State verified the completion of corrective plan of action activities by conducting outreach to the LEAs. To satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, LDOE runs SER evaluation compliance reports that are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 247 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 64.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.59% | 97.71% | 96.16% | 97.20% | 96.99% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 1,132 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 36 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 875 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 15 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 24 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 875 | 1,057 | 96.99% | 100% | 82.78% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Louisiana experienced slippage for this indicator due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although school systems reopened for in-person learning in FFY 2020, school systems still struggled with noncompliance for COVID-related reasons. For instance, some LEAs experienced parental delays due safety concerns, e.g., the parent did not feel comfortable bringing in the child to another environment to be assessed. Other LEAs experienced delays due to personnel, the parents, or even the child testing positive for COVID.

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

182

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

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

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

Louisiana FFY 2020 Indicator 12 Reasons for Non-Compliance and Range of Days

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

State monitoring

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

There are two components to LDOE's data collection method:  
  
First, LDOE engages in a monthly review of relevant data. IDEA Part C program staff, managed by Louisiana’s Department of Health, provides LDOE monthly reports and eligibility data. LDOE’s Part B staff, including the Indicator 12 manager, collaborate with LDOE’s data analytics personnel to identify children who were referred and determined to be NOT eligible, and whose eligibility was determined prior to his/her third birthday.  
  
Second, LDOE conducts a yearly review of these data. LDOE compiles a report from its state database, the Special Education Reporting (SER) system, that includes data for the entire reporting year. The report identifies the percentage of compliance for the last year, by quarter, for each school system. After this report is completed, the Indicator 12 manager assembles a list of LEAs that did not meet the federally-mandated 100% target. LDOE then notifies any LEA with noncompliance. LEAs must submit the completed Plan of Action within 30 days that indicates the reason for the delay, the root cause and what they will do to rectify the situation.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33 | 30 | 3 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance and placed in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP includes activities that target the areas of noncompliance listed on the monitoring report. For each CAP activity, the LEA must submit a deliverable according to the timeline prescribed on the CAP. Each CAP activity is reviewed and feedback is given to the LEA as to whether or not the deliverable is sufficient to address the activity on the CAP. If the deliverable is not sufficient, the LEA is notified and they are directed to resubmit with the correct information. If the information submitted is sufficient, then the LEA is notified that the activity is complete for that particular activity and timeline. Once the LEA has been found to sufficiently have completed all activities on the CAP by the LDOE reviewer, the LEA is sent an email closing out the CAP. The LEA must also go through a follow-up monitoring (desk review or onsite) where new data is reviewed to see if systemic changes of compliance have occurred from prior monitoring.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance and placed in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP includes activities that target the areas of noncompliance listed on the monitoring report. For each CAP activity, the LEA must submit a deliverable according to the timeline prescribed on the CAP. Each CAP activity is reviewed and feedback is given to the LEA as to whether or not the deliverable is sufficient to address the activity on the CAP. If the deliverable is not sufficient, the LEA is notified and they are directed to resubmit with the correct information. If the information submitted is sufficient, then the LEA is notified that the activity is complete for that particular activity and timeline. Once the LEA has been found to sufficiently have completed all activities on the CAP by the LDOE reviewer, the LEA is sent an email closing out the CAP. The LEA must also go through a follow-up monitoring (desk review or onsite) where new data is reviewed to see if systemic changes of compliance have occurred from prior monitoring.

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

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

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and two findings identified in 2018 were corrected.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 53.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 135 | 135 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

State monitoring

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

For this indicator, Louisiana obtained monitoring results through desk audits and self-assessments. The State initially targeted specific schools for an on-site monitoring event if they scored at Quartile 1 (the highest risk) of a risk analysis rubric. The rubric considered year to year changes in ELA and Math proficiency on statewide assessments, graduation rate, drop-out rate, and Special Education LEA Determinations. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, on-site monitoring events were changed to desk reviews.  
  
The State focused monitoring on the effective general supervision of IDEA Part B and an effective transition process. The State reviewed records to determine the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that included: 1) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are updated annually and upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals, and 2) annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. Further, the State reviewed records for evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.  
  
The State also required selected LEAs to complete a self-assessment tool to determine if student transition records were compliant with the following established criteria. LEAs use a state-mandated process to identify records to review. LEAs follow a state-developed protocol to determine if the selected transition plan in the current IEP meets required components, including 1) measurable postsecondary goals that cover education/training, employment, and as needed, independent living; 2) annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable students to meet their postsecondary goal(s); 3) evidence that representatives of external agencies were invited to IEP meetings; and 4) courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of students to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.  
  
LDOE reviewed 72 records and LEAs completed self-assessments on an additional 63 records, for a total of 135 records of youth aged 16 and above reviewed for compliance.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

**II. *Data Reporting***

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

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

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

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 33.00% | 35.00% | 37.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| A | 25.30% | Data | 36.68% | 39.48% | 39.33% | 39.68% | 34.79% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 76.00% | 79.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 84.00% |
| B | 55.30% | Data | 72.30% | 74.98% | 76.93% | 79.32% | 65.93% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 90.00% | 92.00% | 94.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% |
| C | 73.60% | Data | 87.26% | 87.16% | 88.30% | 89.78% | 88.82% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 34.00% | 35.00% | 36.00% | 37.00% | 38.00% | 39.00% |
| Target B >= | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% |
| Target C >= | 90.00% | 90.50% | 91.00% | 91.50% | 92.00% | 92.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 5,427 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 3,031 |
| Response Rate | 55.85% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 979 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 1,023 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 395 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 266 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 979 | 3,031 | 34.79% | 34.00% | 32.30% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 2,002 | 3,031 | 65.93% | 74.00% | 66.05% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 2,663 | 3,031 | 88.82% | 90.00% | 87.86% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Students in Louisiana, including students with disabilities, can pursue two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, either the TOPS University diploma or a Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma. The TOPS University diploma pathway prepares students for four-year colleges and universities. The Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma pathway equips students with the skills and industry-valued credentials, or Industry Based Certifications (IBC), to move into a chosen industry after high school. With the implementation of the Jump Start diploma, the State has seen an increase in students pursuing this diploma pathway. Jump Start students graduate high school prepared to secure a high-wage job and attend a technical or community college. Additionally, school systems can develop Jump Start pathways for careers specific to their geographic location. |

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

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

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 52.59% | 55.85% |

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

The State's Post School Transition survey is provided to school systems. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth using their preferred method, and results are collected in the State's Special Education Reporting (SER) system. To increase the response rate year over year, the LDOE will also provide school systems with a QR code for the survey to disseminate to youth who are no longer in high school. Youth who are no longer in school can use the QR code to complete the survey on a mobile device. The SER system is also being enhanced to collect more contact information, such as an email address, to better reach youth who are no longer in school.   
  
Furthermore, the LDOE will consider using its Be Engaged Initiative to promote participation in the post school transition survey. Within the initiative, the LDOE uses PimsPoints, a system designed to support and ignite engagement. The post school transition survey can be shared with parents in PimsPoints, who can encourage or assist youth with completing the survey.

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

The LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2020 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

Louisiana uses a census method to collect data; the State does not sample. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth, and results are captured in the State's Special Education Reporting (SER) data system. In FFY 2020, LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2020 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

YES

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

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

The LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2020 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

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

Louisiana's Post School Transition survey: https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/post-school-transition-survey.pdf?sfvrsn=17909b1f\_4

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
OSEP cannot determine whether the State analyzed the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, including steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.  
  
The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, including steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.  
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 17 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 10 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

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

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 60.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| Data | 54.55% | 66.67% | 50.00% | 28.57% | 35.29% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 17 | 35.29% | 75.00% | 58.82% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

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

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 11 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 4 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 1 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

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

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% |
| Data | 33.33% | 71.43% | 50.00% | 70.59% | 72.73% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 1 | 11 | 72.73% | 82.00% | 45.45% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Due to the relatively small number of overall cases, the LDOE expects year to year variance in the percent of mediation requests that resulted in mediation agreements. LDOE is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. Therefore, LDOE has developed several processes, including those described below, for resolving disagreements about the provision of a free appropriate public education, payment for services obtained, or a child's eligibility, evaluation, level of services, or placement.  
  
IEP FACILITATION  
IEP facilitation is available to parents and school systems. Typically, an IEP Facilitator is brought in when parents and school system staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school system can request IEP facilitation; however, since the process is voluntary, both sides must agree to participate. The process can be initiated by request to the Legal Division of the State Department of Education, and the service is provided at no cost to the parent or the school system.  
  
INFORMAL COMPLAINTS/EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS  
Parents of children with disabilities may file informal complaints. The implementation of the informal complaint/Early Resolution Process (ERP) draws on the traditional model of parents and school systems working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.  
  
FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION  
A parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written request with LDOE to begin a formal complaint investigation. Formal complaint investigation procedures are developed under the supervisory jurisdiction of the LDOE to address allegations that a school system is violating a requirement of Part B of the IDEA. The formal complaint investigation request is also limited by regulations to action(s) occurring within one year before the formal complaint was filed.  
  
MEDIATION  
Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school systems regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school systems may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.  
  
Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school systems with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation is a voluntary process, and all parties must agree to participate in order for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location that is convenient to the parties in the dispute. Mediation services are provided by LDOE at no cost to parents and school systems.  
  
A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The discussions in a mediation session are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent due process hearings or civil court proceedings. If the mediation process results in full or partial agreement, the mediator will prepare a written mediation agreement that must be signed by both parties. In addition to describing agreements made in the course of mediation, the mediation agreement will state that all discussions that occurred during the mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in a due process hearing or civil court proceeding. The signed agreement shall be legally binding on both parties and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.  
  
DUE PROCESS HEARING  
A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an administrative law judge (ALJ) to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school system regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability. Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school system may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability within one year of the date that the alleged action forming the basis of the hearing request was known or should have been known. This one-year limit does not apply if the parents were prevented from requesting the hearing because the school system specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school system withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).  
  
Once a request for a hearing is received, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an ALJ to the case, and he or she will be provided with a copy of the hearing request. Otherwise, the request remains confidential. The ALJ will then coordinate a prehearing conference to discuss the hearing process and establish a schedule for activities related to the hearing. Please see attachment for the Introduction for additional information.

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

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

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

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

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

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

Louisiana's theory of action states that if (a) data-informed decision making, (b) evidence-based literacy practices and (c) continuous leadership development are implemented with fidelity then (a) districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, (b) educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, and (c) districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades.  
  
Louisiana's theory of action can also be accessed on page 6 here: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=70a66518\_2

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

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the** **decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

ELA proficiency and literacy development for students with disabilities continues to be a priority in Louisiana. Prioritizing literacy and embedding supports in Louisiana's ELA Guidebook curriculum will continue to propel students with disabilities toward increased achievement tied to our SiMR. While the pandemic negatively impacted student achievement across Louisiana, observational data remains consistent that the vast majority of educators in the cohort are implementing high quality curriculum and are collaboratively planning for effective delivery of instruction. As our state strategically addresses the impacts of the pandemic, educator development needs to intentionally support the SSIP strategies through effective instruction and effective literacy instruction.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 34.03% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 29.50% | 30.50% | 31.50% | 32.50% | 33.50% | 34.50% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Scored Proficient in ELA** | **Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Took ELA 3-5 Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 158 | 572 |  | 29.50% | 27.62% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

The outcome data source for 2020-2021 directly connected to the SiMR is Louisiana statewide ELA assessment data for students with disabilities in the cohort schools in grades 3-5.

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

Louisiana continues to collect data from a variety of sources. Using the data collection plan, the Department will collect both implementation and outcome data. Outcome measures are collected using Louisiana LEAP 2025 annual statewide assessment results. Implementation measures are collected using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool, 3-12 Classroom Support Tool and the Common Planning Time Tool which measure high quality curriculum implementation and teacher development/collaboration practices.

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

YES

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

Despite challenges from the pandemic, the School Improvement Team conducted over 2,000 classroom observations across Louisiana in K-12 classrooms using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool and the 3-12 Classroom Support Tool (virtual tools used when conducting virtual observations). Team members also observed 229 common planning sessions using the Common Planning Tool. In the SSIP cohort schools, the School Improvement Team conducted 158 total classroom observations and common planning time observations at 28 out of the 30 schools in the cohort.   
  
Trends that emerged included approximately 98% of teachers using high quality, top-rated instructional materials every day in classrooms across Louisiana. Additionally, the vast majority of teachers have common planning time built into their daily schedules and collaborate/plan with colleagues. Changes to our School Improvement Team and our School Improvement Best Practices strategy for 2021-2022 will result in different evaluation and school support tools that are not aligned to the curriculum and observation tools used in 2020-2021 and prior years. The shift from evaluating curriculum implementation to intentional support of system and school leaders and educators in key professional practices is supported by this data. The School Improvement Team will support two targeted School Improvement Best Practices, including Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Collaboration. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

NO

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

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

In 2019-2020, standardized assessments were not administered in Louisiana due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Following that year, in 2020-2021, while assessments were administered, Louisiana requested and received a waiver for required accountability systems. To ensure a Strong Start to the 2020-2021 school year, Louisiana focused on helping school systems address unfinished learning from the 2019-2020 school year, set the foundation for continuous learning in 2020-2021 and prepare for potential modified operations across our state, with many students learning in a virtual or hybrid setting. Our assessment data in 2020 shows drastic impacts of COVID-19 on student achievement in our state. In 2020-2021, instruction looked substantially different for many students, with many students learning virtually for all or part of the year. All grades, content areas, subgroups and almost all school systems saw decline with a disproportionate impact among elementary students, mathematics, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and students who spent more time learning virtually. The pandemic and natural disasters in 2020-2021 also resulted in major attendance concerns across the state as evident in feedback surveys.   
  
Throughout the 2020-2021 school year, specific guidance and synchronous and asynchronous training targeting virtual instruction was provided to all Louisiana educators. Louisiana’s annual Teacher Leader Summit in Spring 2020 was transformed into a virtual series of more than 40 free, interactive webinars, bringing together a host of educators and content experts focused on creating meaningful growth for every student, every day. The virtual series focused on ensuring educators were prepared for the 2020-2021 school year and continue to provide high-quality instruction to all students.   
  
In the Spring of 2021, the annual Teacher Leader Summit was a hybrid event, with both in-person and virtual sessions to meet the needs of educators, while also ensuring safety due to COVID-19.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

Louisiana remains committed to the theory of action, logic model and evaluation as interconnected components of the SSIP. In Phase III, the outcomes and data continue to drive our evidence-based literacy practices as well as continued professional development. Our evaluation plan is the same on pages 30-31 of the SSIP for 2019-2020 at this link: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf.  
  
Louisiana's LEAs also had to submit Strong Start Reopening Plans for 2020-2021 which are linked on our Strong Start landing page here: https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/strong-start-2020.

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

NO

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

Academic Supports: To ensure a Strong Start to the 2020-2021 school year, Louisiana pivoted and focused on helping LEAs ensure continuous learning for all students, address unfinished learning, and prepare for the possibility of continued modified operations due to COVID-19. The Department provided guidance to reopening schools safely and provided Strong Start Priorities, including:  
- Addressing unfinished learning from the 2019-2020 school year,  
- Setting the foundation for continuous learning in 2020-2021, and  
- Preparing for school facility closures and modified operations.  
These priorities were included in the Super App process, the comprehensive planning and budgeting tool that guides LEAs through aligning key priorities and funding sources. This process has been used since 2018.  
  
Strong Start 2020: A Toolkit for Teaching and Learning for Schools was launched in the summer of 2020 designed to ensure high quality continuous learning as students returned from school closures in a variety of learning modes, and the Toolkit included samples, models, and LEA/school actions across several domains: implementing assessment and individualized plans, continuous core instruction, continuous non-core instruction, student and staff well-being, communication plans, staffing plans, and 1:1 devices. Specific guidance was provided to support educators and students with disabilities, including:  
- Strong Start 2020: Reopening Guidance for Special Education Leaders   
- Strong Start 2020: Reopening Guidance for Direct Service Providers   
- Strong Start 2020: Timelines and Documentation for Students with Disabilities   
- Family Toolbox: Strong Start 2020 Support for Students with Disabilities   
Louisiana also provided PPE, rapid COVID testing kids and supplies to help ensure safety of educators and students, which also supported safety for secure testing environments as well as flexible testing windows that supported a successful 2020 statewide assessment administration.   
  
Educator Development: The Department offered 3-5 ELA Guidebooks professional development sessions on unit unpacking during the 2021 Teacher Leader Summit. Louisiana teachers and instructional staff attended in person sessions on May 25th-27th, 2021, and additional teachers and instructional staff participated in virtual sessions from June 1st-17th, 2021. Goals and participant numbers for each of the three-part Professional Development sequence are as follows:  
- 3-5 Guidebooks New Unit Study Tool: Begin with the End in Mind (Part 1 of 3) In person: 249 Virtual: 196  
 Understand the importance of starting with the end in mind (for both students and teachers);   
 Learn and apply Step 1 of the Guidebooks 3.0 Unit Study Protocol by unpacking the knowledge and skills required for success on the Culminating Writing   
 Task;  
- 3-5 Guidebooks New Unit Study Tool: Text at the Center (Part 2 of 3) In person: 221 Virtual: 192  
 Deepen and extend understanding the importance of knowledge building through texts;  
 Describe the structure and purpose of conceptually coherent text sets in the Guidebooks curriculum;  
 Learn and apply Step 2 of the Unit Study Process (Text at the Center) by analyzing how each text supports knowledge building within the unit and supports   
 completion of the Culminating Task;  
- 3-5 Guidebooks New Unit Study Tool: Identifying High-Leverage Exit Tickets (Part 3 of 3) In person: 209 Virtual: 200  
 Deepen and extend understanding of the Guidebooks lesson checks for understanding, including the process for determining high leverage exit tickets; and  
 Learn and apply Step 3 of the Unit Study Process (High Leverage Exit Tickets) in order to monitor students’ progress in gaining the knowledge and skills   
 necessary for the Culminating Writing Task.  
Content leader and teacher leader structures continued to provide leadership pipelines for LEAs developing talented teachers and equipping them with the knowledge and skills to lead other teachers. In the future, principal and leader development will also be a focus.  
  
Literacy: Information and input gathered from the Foundational Reading Supports Pilot led to implementing a Literacy Coaching Pilot in 2020-2021. Louisiana offered free literacy training for leaders and teachers in Summer 2021. If administrators have an understanding of the science of reading, they can provide support to teachers around more effective curriculum implementation, utilizing systematic, explicit interventions for struggling readers, and providing ongoing professional development. The pilot will be scaled to include additional literacy coach support to LEAs and also resulted in a comprehensive strategic plan for literacy in Louisiana and a Reading Revival Campaign.   
  
Teacher Leader Summit in Spring 2020 was transformed into a virtual series of more than 40 free, interactive webinars, bringing together a host of educators and content experts focused on creating meaningful growth for every student, every day. The virtual series focused on ensuring educators were prepared for the 2020-2021 school year and continue to provide high-quality instruction to all students. In the Spring of 2021, the annual Teacher Leader Summit was a hybrid event, with both in-person and virtual sessions to meet the needs of educators, while also ensuring safety due to COVID-19. Currently, Teacher Leader Summit for 2022 is planned for an in-person event to celebrate “Louisiana’s Comeback.”  
  
The School Improvement Team continued to support many LEAs in 2020-2021 although many visits, observations and collaborations were conducted virtually. Over 2,000 classroom observations in K-12 were conducted using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool and 3-12 Classroom Support Tool (virtual tools used for virtual observations) and 229 common planning observations were conducted using the Common Planning Tool. The Department partnered with the National Institute of Excellence in Teaching to provide Department staff training and support on virtual observation and feedback as well as virtual instruction support training for all Louisiana educators. In 2021-2022 the School Improvement Team will refocus on the School Improvement Best Practice strategy to provide targeted, differentiated support to school systems by supporting and coaching LEA and school leaders on Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Collaboration. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year.  
  
Co-teaching training occurred for Louisiana educators; however, the co-teaching pilot did not occur since Louisiana shifted our focus on accelerating learning in response to the impact of the pandemic.

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

Louisiana continues to align the SSIP with the SPDG carrying out a multi-layered approach to driving improved student outcomes for students with disabilities. The Super App school planning process is still utilized and was aligned to the Strong Start priorities previously mentioned in response to the pandemic. The Strong Start priorities and suite of guidance better prepared educators and students for a return to school. The planning process continues to allow school systems to use data in planning, budgeting and implementation in alignment with key priorities. This operating cycle continues each year.  
  
Louisiana is also committed in its structures to embed supports for students with disabilities and ownership of outcomes across all offices in the Department. Specifically related to our SiMR, the Department has continued work to embed supports for diverse learners in its ELA Guidebook curriculum with feedback and development from Louisiana educators. This work will continue in 2021-2022 with a release of updated grades 3-5 units.  
  
Our educator development structures include Content Leader and Teacher Leader initiatives that impact LEAs and sustainability by developing cadres of talented teacher leaders each year who develop the knowledge and skills to lead and coach other teachers in their LEAs and schools. The School Improvement Team also conducts similar technical assistance and support in some of our most struggling schools throughout the state intended to provide LEA and school leaders with curriculum implementation and educator development knowledge and skills that allow them to scale that support throughout their schools. Our SPED Fellow Academy, which began its first cohort in 2020-2021, is a year-long, comprehensive development program for novice special education leaders across the state. The fellowship will provide in-person training, coaching, and a community of practice that will instill the knowledge and skills the next generation of leaders need to lead and sustain change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

The Strong Start 2020 academic supports allowed for continuous learning for students in Louisiana whether they were learning remotely or in-person, and this included a suite of guidance to ensure continuous learning and instructional and related services for students with disabilities. Statewide assessments were able to be safely, securely administered because of the reopening guidance and supports. Early childhood centers were able to reopen during 2020-2021, while at the height of the pandemic 70% of those centers were closed.  
  
While Louisiana’s Content Leader structure is not new, the addition of K-2 Literacy Content Leaders allows K-2 educators supporting literacy to deeply understand the components of effective literacy instruction and the foundations of reading, the essential elements of high quality literacy curriculum, and to apply best practice of adult learning in supporting fellow educators. This work will continue in 2021-2022.  
  
Staff and Student Well-Being: Following the pandemic increased focus was placed on supporting staff and student well-being. Guidance and supports were included as part of the Strong Start Guidance and partnerships including Children’s Hospital of New Orleans provided a Town Hall Series and free virtual mental health sessions for educators and staff. Short-term outcomes included being able to provide wellness support to staff across Louisiana that support transparency of COVID-related information and support their well-being such that academic outcomes can continue.  
  
Louisiana’s 1:1 device push, Learning Management System guidance, and community partnerships for connectivity resulted in a surge of Chromebooks and devices into schools addressing the technical divide in our state. Emergency Broad Band Benefits for Families program assists eligible households or school systems in paying for home internet services during the pandemic.  
  
For 2021-2022 focus and continued work around supporting educators with addressing unfinished learning, accelerating learning, effective literacy instruction, and staffing and scheduling guidance will be a focus. A comprehensive literacy plan, foundational literacy training, and literacy coaching structure in CIR/UIR-A schools will be a priority.

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

Louisiana uses a multi-layered approach to implementing specific structures and best practices intended to increase outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities. Louisiana’s Strong Start plan and each LEA’s aligned Strong Start Plans will allow them to prioritize addressing learning loss as a result of the pandemic, ensuring continuous learning, and supporting staff and student well-being. Additionally, the Strong Start academic guidance will equip leaders and educators with supports needed to educate their students through a continuing pandemic.  
  
While our Content Leader and Teacher Leader structures will continue, a key improvement will involve adding K-2 Content Leaders in alignment with a continued, strategic literacy focus. Implementing specific literacy practices will directly impact the SiMR and result in more students, including students with disabilities, achieve proficiency on ELA assessments.   
  
For 2021-2022 focus and continued work around supporting educators with addressing unfinished learning, accelerating learning, effective literacy instruction, and staffing and scheduling guidance will be a focus. A comprehensive literacy plan, foundational literacy training, and literacy coaching structure in CIR/UIR-A schools will be a priority. Additionally, the Division of Diverse Learners, including special education, is repositioning within the Department in the Office of Teaching and Learning, which will provide for clear, concise ownership of outcomes for students with disabilities and regular collaboration and integration of special education across all aspects of academics.

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

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports  
High quality summer learning programs   
Additional instructional time for students to address learning loss via Accelerate  
Literacy supports

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Louisiana continues to intentionally expand efforts and embed diverse learner supports within high quality instructional materials. Louisiana's ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum helps all students read, understand, and express their understanding of complex, grade-level texts. The new Louisiana ELA Guidebooks 3-5, build students’ understanding and knowledge through text sets, compelling questions, and integrated reading and writing activities. The ELA Guidebooks updates began in November 2020 and will be complete by May 2022. Pilot units were released in November 2021, the implementation and review of the pilot units begins in January 2022 and will continue through 2022. These updates include the addition of core and optional activities to support the needs of diverse learners and it gives teachers the opportunity to provide students with real time support through the embedded activities. Additionally, the department has partnered with The Writing Revolution? in July 2020 to incorporate in context writing instruction into ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) and this partnership continues as we finalize updates to ELA Guidebooks.   
  
Summer Learning Guidance for incoming K-8 students was released in Spring 2021 as a way to continue to address unfinished learning and provide additional learning opportunities in the elementary and middle grades. The guidance focused on structures and elements of a summer program, resources for implementing elements, staffing and scheduling considerations, sample schedules, checklists for action steps and funding information. Additional, updated, more robust Summer Learning Guidance will be provided for Summer 2022.  
  
Accelerate, Louisiana’s Pre-K-12 Tutoring Strategy, was launched in Spring 2021 and was designed for school systems to implement equal access tutoring at-scale in order to achieve significant results for all students. Grounded in the most impactful research-based practices, Accelerate is a just-in-time, pre-teaching model that addresses unfinished learning by building knowledge and connecting it to skills in current lessons. In addition to guidance on implementation, Louisiana released Pre-K-12 ELA and math tutoring materials in phases during 2021 and will continue this work in 2022.  
  
Louisiana’s Literacy Team formed in 2020-2021 to continue literacy supports across the state. The Foundational Reading Supports Pilot led to implementing a Literacy Coaching Pilot in 2020-2021. Louisiana offered free literacy training for leaders and teachers in Summer 2021. If administrators have an understanding of the science of reading, they can provide support to teachers around more effective curriculum implementation, utilizing systematic, explicit interventions for struggling readers, and providing ongoing professional development. Additionally, the Real-time Early Access to Literacy (REAL) initiative provided individualized support for students in pre-K through grade 3 to make progress in their literacy development, with a focus on support for virtual learning in 2020-2021. REAL provides devices, connectivity, and tutoring services to eligible students in pre-K through grade 3. Continued literacy work will scale to include additional literacy coach support to LEAs, a comprehensive strategic plan for literacy in Louisiana and a Reading Revival Campaign.

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

Each of the evidence-based practices are aimed at providing comprehensive support for educators in all grades, but specifically ELA educators in grades 3-5. Our 3-5 ELA Guidebook updates will strengthen and embed diverse learner supports and intentional writing supports into the curriculum which will directly impact their achievement on aligned statewide assessments used to measure the SiMR. The Summer Learning Guidance will help LEAs plan and implement effective, accessible summer learning, especially targeting Mathematics and ELA instruction, aimed at addressing accelerating learning for all students following the pandemic, which is aimed at targeting the drastic impact of the pandemic on student achievement. Similarly, the Accelerate tutoring strategy provides additional, extra time support for students who need it in Mathematics and ELA with specific, high quality instructional materials free and accessible to all educators. Strategic literacy best practices will continue to be refined and implemented to support literacy development such that students in grades 3-5 will be on grade-level and increase outcomes in ELA. This layered approach to implement SSIP strategies is intended to increase student achievement.

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

In 2020-2021, the 3-12 Classroom Observation, the 3-12 Virtual Classroom Observation, and the Common Planning Time Tool were both used to collect data for the SSIP cohort. While the cohort includes 30 schools in 8 LEAs, 28 schools are reflected in the data. A total of 158 observations within the 28 schools were conducted. While the ongoing pandemic presented challenges, Louisiana conducted as many visits as possible, some being virtual. The classroom observation tools help observers determine to what extent the teacher is using and delivering a high-quality curriculum, the degree to which students are actively engaged, whether the teacher is actively monitoring student learning and providing feedback. The Common Planning Time Tool assist observers with determining if teachers are planning using high-quality materials and if they are planning for student supports and anticipating student needs.  
  
The tools were refined and updated for 2020-2021. Trends that emerged included the vast majority of teachers using high quality curriculum materials. Additionally, the vast majority of teachers have common planning time built into their daily schedules and collaborate/plan with colleagues. This is a result of our Super App Process and funding alignment to support adoption of high quality materials as well as the support and technical assistance provided.  
  
Changes to our School Improvement Team and our School Improvement Best Practices strategy for 2021-2022 will result in different evaluation and school support tools that are not aligned to the curriculum and observation tools used in 2020-2021 and prior years. The shift from evaluating curriculum implementation to intentional support of system and school leaders and educators in key professional practices is supported by this data. The School Improvement Team will support two targeted School Improvement Best Practices, including Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Collaboration. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

N/A

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

In Spring 2022, the 3-5 ELA Guidebooks (2022) will release and will include embedded supports for students with disabilities and other diverse learners. Professional development and support will begin at Teacher Leader Summit 2022 and continue into the 2022-2023 school year.  
  
Prioritizing high quality summer learning programs to address learning loss will continue. Updated guidance and materials will release in 2021-2022 and will include future state requirements for the most struggling schools to implement summer learning programs.  
  
An Accelerate learning pilot will inform next steps around accelerating learning strategies. Accelerate materials, aligned to high quality materials, will continue to be released and updated. A comprehensive state accelerating learning plan and communications plan will be critical steps in development.  
  
A statewide literacy plan has been launched and key literacy legislation driving improvement beginning 202102022, but additional literacy supports will continue to be developed. Literacy interventions and extensions will release. K-2 Literacy Content Leaders will be added to our educator development structure and required foundational literacy training for all K-2 educators will begin.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. This inclusive vision and Louisiana’s values were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025. The LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025: 1) internal review, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration.  
  
Internal Review   
The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.   
  
External Stakeholder Feedback  
The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets.   
  
SEAP Integration  
The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback.  
  
The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

Louisiana worked to help educators ensure a strong return from the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2021 and beyond. It is important to stay connected to Louisiana students, families, teachers, and leaders and Louisiana has prioritized listening and learning from the experiences of stakeholders during this most challenging school year. Throughout 2020-2021, over 10,500 school reopening support emails were processed. The agency also facilitated a dozen bi-weekly virtual town hall meetings with Children’s Hospital New Orleans for educators and families, enhanced its communications structures to include more targeted office hours and team-specific monthly calls, and a chief academic officers roundtable. Statewide working groups were also created in key areas of support for school system leaders to share progress, provide feedback on current and future resources, and keep the agency updated on statewide implementation measures. Additional commissions, including the Special Education Advisory Panel, Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council, Continuous Learning Taskforce and Early Literacy Commission, stakeholder input from the Literacy Coaching Pilot, Exceptional Lives Louisiana, and our Families Helping Families partners were used to gain input and feedback from a variety of stakeholders.  
  
The ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) have been developed in collaboration with Louisiana teachers who work on the project as designers. These designers work collaboratively with the Department to develop essential aspects of the curriculum updates which includes the development of lesson scope and sequences, embedding support for diverse learners, and developing lesson activities that support the needs of all learners. Louisiana will continue to elicit feedback from the field about the three ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) pilot units which were released in November 2021. The implementation and review of the pilot units began January 2022 and will be complete by May 2022.   
  
Louisiana did partner with Westat in 2021 to conduct focus groups with stakeholders across the state and analyze Strong Start surveys about lessons learned from virtual instruction. This feedback from students, educators, and families will help inform future decisions. The data included 46 focus group sessions conducted with a total of 216 stakeholders in November and December of 2020, as well as the results of the Department’s Strong Start Survey series completed by 281 school systems. Findings note that key strengths and successes based on our stakeholder feedback include:  
- School systems and educators have flexibly adapted to address students' learning loss through use of individual instruction/support, additional intervention time, and increased use of small group instruction.   
- LEAs have pushed technology out to students and families very quickly, and teachers have learned and adopted a variety of technologically-based teaching supports.  
- Most stakeholders believe communication from LDOE and from school systems and schools has been very effective. Transparency and the levels of trust among stakeholders is high.   
- School systems and educators have made extensive efforts to support students’ mental health and well-being both personally and through SEL curricula and community services.   
  
Key opportunities for growth include:  
- Transition between learning modes causes disruption of learning, stress, and mental-health concerns.   
- In general, student engagement is a concern. Not all students learn successfully in virtual environments, particularly students with disabilities, EL students and early childhood learners.   
- Ongoing concerns with accountability plans given likely learning loss that is beyond the control of school systems and families.   
- Access to technology and broadband required for successful virtual learning is not consistent for all students.   
- Maintaining contact and communication with families for those affected by hurricanes and the economy has been challenging. Attendance and truancy are major concerns.  
  
Louisiana also has a website dedicated to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report and target setting process. Stakeholders can find information about IDEA requirements, a target setting overview and data, and they can submit a survey to provide input on the plan and our target setting process. The overview presentation was shared with the Special Education Advisory Panel and the Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Councils.

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

Throughout 2020-2021 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, more detailed input and included the following:  
  
Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)  
Continuous Learning Task Force  
Early Literacy Commission  
Literacy Coaching Pilot  
Content Leader and ELA Guidebook Pilot feedback   
Teacher Leader Advisors  
Families Helping Families  
Exceptional Lives Louisiana  
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council

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

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Stakeholder feedback and input is valued at all levels of engagement. Concerns expressed during 2020-2021 were focused on the various modes of learning occurring throughout the state, student and family accessibility to technology and connectivity, and mental health of staff and students. Louisiana's Strong Start resources previously described were developed in direct response to these concerns. So while there were no direct concerns from stakeholders engaged around the SiMR and SPP, the general concerns in response to the pandemic and natural disasters faced by Louisiana students, educators and families will certainly have an impact.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

NA

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

NA

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

N/A

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

**Name:**

Meredith Jordan

**Title:**

Executive Director of Diverse Learners

**Email:**

meredith.jordan@la.gov

**Phone:**

225-485-5228

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 10:36:55 PM