

State Performance Plan Part B

July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011

**Under the
Individuals with Disabilities
Education Improvement Act of 2004**

Cecil J. Picard
State Superintendent of Education

December 2, 2005

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1.877.453.2721

www.louisianaschools.net

State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Ms. Glenny Lee Buquet*President*

3rd BESE District

Ms. Polly Broussard

6th BESE District

Mr. Walter Lee*Vice President*

4th BESE District

Mr. Dale Bayard

7th BESE District

Ms. Linda Johnson*Secretary-Treasurer*

8th BESE District

Mr. Edgar Chase

Member-at-Large

Ms. Penny Dastugue

1st BESE District

Ms. Leslie Jacobs

Member-at-Large

Ms. Louella Givens

2nd BESE District

Ms. Mary Washington

Member-at-Large

Dr. James Stafford

5th BESE District

Ms. Weegie Peabody

Executive Director

For further information, contact:**Margaret Brolin****Special Populations****P.O. Box 94064****Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064****225-432-3661/www.Margaret.Brolin@la.gov**

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

This public document was printed at a cost of \$1,975. Five hundred copies (500) of this document were printed in this first printing at a cost of \$1,975. The total cost for the printing of this document, including reprints was \$1,975. This document was printed by the Louisiana Department of Education, Office of Student and School Performance, Division of Special Populations; P.O. Box 94064; Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064. This material was printed in accordance with the standards for printing by State Agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Overview of the State Performance Plan Development.....	4-5
Indicator 1: High School Diploma Rate.....	6-11
Indicator 2: Dropout Rate.....	12-15
Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment.....	16-26
Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion.....	27-31
Indicator 5: Placement of Students, Ages 6-21.....	32-40
Indicator 6: Placement of Students, Ages 3-5.....	41-44
Indicator 7: Performance, Ages 3-5.....	45-46
Indicator 8: Family Involvement.....	47
Indicator 9: Disproportionality, Overall Identification.....	48-50
Indicator 10: Disproportionality, Identification by Classifications.....	51-53
Indicator 11: Timely Evaluations.....	54-55
Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B.....	56-59
Indicator 13: Transition, Ages 16+.....	60
Indicator 14: Transition, Postsecondary Survey.....	61
Indicator 15: General Supervision.....	62-68
Indicators 16-19: Dispute Resolution.....	69-75
Indicator 20: Accurate Data.....	76-79
Attachment 1.....	80

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another venue for broad stakeholder input was a meeting of the Special Education Advisory Council. The Council works closely with Louisiana's Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE), a partially elected, partially appointed board which has the authority to make policy decisions that govern the public

education system. The Council advises BESE on framing state policies, practices and procedures affecting special populations. There was an opportunity for the Advisory Council to review and comment on the SPP at a meeting in October and again in November 2005. In a BESE meeting prior to the submission of the SPP, there was an opportunity for the full Board to review and comment on the SPP, and in December, BESE members approved the final version of Louisiana's State Performance Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the state graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

High school diploma rate for students with disabilities = (# of students with IEPs receiving high school diplomas) / (# of total students who: returned to regular ed + high school diploma + certificate of achievement + reached maximum age + died + moved, known to be continuing + moved, not known to be continuing + dropped out + locally designed skills certificate + Louisiana equivalency diploma + GED and locally designed skills certificate + industry based skills certificate + GED and industry based skills certificate + certificate of course work or activities completion).

Due to variances in the reporting processes, data comparing the graduation rate of students with disabilities to their non-disabled peers are not available at this time. For purposes of NCLB, Louisiana will begin reporting a cohort graduation rate in 2007. This rate will be based on the number of 9th graders enrolled in school in 2002. The formula adjusts for students with disabilities who take longer than the traditional 4-year period to graduate from high school.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

From a strictly numeric standpoint, it appears that the graduation rate has declined from 2002-2003 (22.6%) to 2004-2005 (17.42%). The graduation rates may have decreased because some students with disabilities are choosing the Pre-GED/Skills Options Program, which is considered a positive outcome but which does not result in the receipt of Louisiana’s standard high school diploma. Other reasons for the decline in the graduation rate may be attributed in part to anecdotal reports of inadequate provision of accommodation/modifications to support students with disabilities in regular education settings; students may not be accessing the general education curriculum to the extent necessary to pass required Carnegie Unit classes. Other state data indicate a lack of certified personnel, which in turn impacts the quality of classroom instruction. Finally, the latest version of Louisiana’s high stakes Graduate Exit Exam has a different format than was used in previous years; GEE requires students to possess a different set of skills. Previous Exit Tests were entirely multiple-choice except for one Writing Exam which involved constructing an essay. The new GEE testing format requires many written responses on all test sections so students with poor writing skills are adversely impacted.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	18.00%
2006 (2006-2007)	18.00%

2007 (2007-2008)	19.00%
2008 (2008-2009)	25.00%
2009 (2009-2010)	34.00%
2010 (2010-2011)	40.67%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 1.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>Develop sample activities that support the comprehensive curriculum utilizing various accommodations appropriate for students with disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDE staff will develop sample activities that support the comprehensive curriculum utilizing various accommodations appropriate for students with disabilities, incorporating additional information on identifying/implementing accommodations from other sources, i.e., LDE bulletins, handbooks. A task force of teachers, administrators, parents, etc will be convened to continue the development of activities/accommodations relevant to a variety of disabilities. Through the Administrative Leadership Conference in 2006, the LDE will present to districts an overview of this project and seek volunteers to pilot sample activities/accommodations. LEAs will pilot sample activities/accommodations. The volunteer LEAs will complete an evaluation of the use of these activities/accommodations. LDE will reconvene the original task force to review recommendations/evaluations of the LEAs that participated in the pilot. The task force will determine measures that will indicate progress. LDE will have revised the activities/accommodations and prepare for dissemination at the 2007 Administrative Leadership Conference. 	<p>Dec. 2005</p> <p>Feb. 2006</p> <p>Summer 2006</p> <p>Fall 2006</p> <p>Jan. 2007</p> <p>Spring 2007</p> <p>May 2007</p>	<p>State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Education Service Centers</p> <p>Office of Student and School Performance</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>Parents</p> <p>Access Center</p> <p>National Post School Outcomes Center</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDE will begin training with regular and special education teachers on how to use activities/accommodations in their classroom activities. LEAs will begin using the final activities/accommodations that will support students with disabilities in the comprehensive curriculum. Evaluate LEA implementation of sample activities/accommodations statewide based on task force identified measures. <p>(See also Indicator 3, Activity 3.3, for related improvement activities.)</p>	<p>Fall 2007</p> <p>Winter 2007</p> <p>Spring 2007</p>	<p>National Center on Secondary Education and Transition</p> <p>National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education</p> <p>Center for Implementing Technology in Education</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 1.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>High School Redesign Commission and workgroups will recommend actions to assist the state in redesigning public high schools to address the academic needs of all students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full commission/work group meeting to update activities and develop recommendations for policy change Hold statewide public meetings to disseminate information on recommendations Bring recommendation to BESE Implement <i>High School Counts</i> Campaign—a public outreach campaign from radio and television ads to disseminate information of the high school redesign agenda Create a “P-16 Plus” database that uses unique student identifiers to track young people across K-12, higher education, and the workforce with information published in an annual report Create a <i>High School Counts</i> website which will house annual reports and provide access to information at all levels of education. 	<p>Oct. 2005</p> <p>Winter 2005</p> <p>Jan. 2006</p> <p>2007</p> <p>2007</p> <p>2007</p>	<p>State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p> <p>Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)</p> <p>Business/Community Leaders</p> <p>Students/Parents</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 1.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Implement GEE Waiver Policy for students with disabilities beginning with 2005-06 seniors. This new policy will allow more students with disabilities to graduate by granting the waiver of one Exit Test when the student’s disability significantly interferes with the</p>		<p>State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School &</p>

<p>ability to pass the test provided all other graduation criteria are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final adoption of policy by BESE at October 2005 meeting • LDE personnel draft GEE Waiver procedures • GEE Waiver becomes rule in November 2005 • LDE personnel finalize GEE Waiver procedures • Letters to LEAs indicating timelines/procedures for GEE Waiver requests • LDE committee review GEE Waiver requests and determine recommendation(s) • State Superintendent makes final decision on GEE Waiver request(s) • Notice is sent to LEA indicating final decision • Evaluate GEE Waiver process/procedures <p>Review/Revise GEE Waiver procedures based on Spring 2006 evaluation</p>	<p>Oct. 2005</p> <p>Nov. 2005</p> <p>Dec. 2005</p> <p>Spring 2006</p> <p>Summer 2006</p>	<p>Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 1.4</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Revise graduation policies to allow students with disabilities multiple routes to earn a standard high school diploma:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a survey of all states having high stakes policies for promotion/retention to determine various diploma options for students with disabilities while continuing to maintain high standards for the process. • Review the survey to determine which states have policies that allow students with disabilities to graduate with an equivalent alternate diploma. • Convene a task force of all appropriate stakeholders to review survey results and make recommendations, which maintain high standards for students with disabilities, to State Department of Education for consideration. • The LDE Assistant Superintendents will review the task force recommendations and submit to the State Superintendent. • The State Superintendent will submit appropriate diploma options to the high school redesign committee for their consideration for as agenda item. • The High School Redesign Commission will review and make recommendations for diploma options for BESE 	<p>March 2006</p> <p>April 2006</p> <p>July 2006</p> <p>Fall 2006</p> <p>Spring 2007</p> <p>Summer 2007</p>	<p>State Department of Education :</p> <p>School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>School Improvement & Accountability, Assessment</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>Parents</p> <p>Access Center</p> <p>National Post</p>

<p>review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BESE will refer their recommendations to the Parish Superintendent Association Committee and the Special Education Advisory Council for their recommendations. • The above-noted committees will make its required recommendations to BESE • BESE will approve the plan for an alternative diploma and recommends the development of a legislative package. • During the 2008 legislative session, the new diploma option will be enacted. • BESE will approve the new policies to be included in <i>Bulletin 741</i>. • The revised graduation policy will become rule. • By May 2009, Louisiana will graduate its first class using the revised graduation policies. • LDE will evaluate the new graduation requirements to determine need for revision. 	<p>Fall 2007</p> <p>Spring 2008</p> <p>Spring 2008</p> <p>August 2008</p> <p>January 2009</p> <p>May 2009</p> <p>Summer 2010</p>	<p>School Outcomes Center</p> <p>National Center on Secondary Education and Transition</p> <p>National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education</p> <p>Exiting Community of Practice</p> <p>Postsecondary Education Consortium</p> <p>National Information Clearinghouse on Children who are Deaf-blind</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 1.5</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>The Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) will include monitoring activities to assess the availability of appropriate transition services to prepare students for life and work after school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize the current <i>Transition Compliance Checklist</i> to measure SPP requirements for Indicator #13: <i>Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</i> • Use <i>Transition Compliance Checklist</i> for evaluating 16+ year-old students' programming in all initial on-site monitoring visits. • Maintain Transition Compliance Data for annual evaluation of progress in providing for appropriate transition services to students. • Compare Transition Compliance Data with Graduation and Dropout Data to determine if transition compliance correlates with graduation and dropout data. • Continue monitoring activities for transition planning and results. 	<p>2005-2006</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>2006-2007</p> <p>2007-2011</p>	<p>Department of Education Transition Staff</p> <p>CIMP Monitoring Staff</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Dropout percent = (# of students with IEPs who dropout) / (# of students who returned to regular ed + high school diploma + certificate of achievement + reached maximum age + died + moved, known to be continuing + moved, not known to be continuing + dropped out + locally designed skills certificate + Louisiana equivalency diploma + GED and locally designed skills certificate + industry based skills certificate + GED and industry-based skills certificate + certificate of coursework or activities completion). This is the calculation that Louisiana has used in reporting dropout percents to the public. Due to variances in the reporting processes, data comparing the dropout rate of students with disabilities to their non-disabled peers is not available at this time.

Louisiana has been reporting dropout data on students with disabilities using the above formula. We also have been utilizing the NCES definition to report dropouts on all students since 1995. Some regular education and special education students, who would have previously dropped out because of the rigorous standard diploma requirements, now enroll in Pre-GED/Skills Options Programs. During the 2003-2004 school year, there were 2,877 students with disabilities enrolled in Pre-GED/Skills Options Programs. A Pre-GED/Skills Option Program is defined as an alternative to regular education. If a student who pursues this Option is successful in passing the GED, he/she receives a Louisiana High School Equivalency Diploma and a Skills Certificate for completing specified vocational training. There is no opportunity upon completion of the Pre-GED/Skills Option Program to earn a standard Louisiana High School Diploma without going back to high school and completing both Carnegie Unit and Assessment Testing requirements. Individual students, either regular or special education, may be considered on a case-by-case basis to re-enter the regular program.

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

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): The percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school during the 2004-2005 school year was 26.27%.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2007 (2007-2008)	23.0%
2008 (2008-2009)	21.0%
2009 (2009-2010)	18.6%
2010 (2010-2011)	17.7%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 2.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>High School Redesign Commission and Workgroups will recommend actions to assist the state in redesigning public high schools to address the academic needs of all general education and special education students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze data and trends in dropout data based on regular/special education, gender, ethnicity, rural/urban. • Analyze assessment results for regular and special education students. • Analyze data by individual LEA to identify school districts that show decrease in dropout rate according to trend data as well as school districts that show an increase in dropout rate. <p>(See also Indicator 1, Activity 1.2 for additional activities involving the High School Redesign Commission.)</p>	<p>Oct. 2005 Ongoing</p>	<p>Personnel from State Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p> <p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>Office of Student and School Performance</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p> <p>Personnel from the Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)</p> <p>Business/Community Leaders</p> <p>Students, Parents</p>
Improvement Activity 2.2	Timelines	Resources
<p>As a component of Louisiana’s Proposal for National Governors Association (NGA) Honor States Grant Program, LDE will develop policies and programs into a “safety-net” to prevent as many students as possible from dropping out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an Early Warning Data and Reporting System 		<p>Department of Education:</p> <p>Office of School & Community Support</p>

<p>that signals 7th-9th grade teachers, counselors, parents and administrators when students need extra support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide free access to ACT’s Explore, Plan, ACT System • Create a web-based “Lifelong Learning Education Portal” through which a student can plan and monitor his/her academic progress from middle school through post-secondary education and into the workforce. • Develop a set of statewide “catch-up course” curricula and teacher training which double the amount of math/reading instruction, incorporate systematic and highly structured curricula and teaching strategies, and make use of diagnostic assessments. 	2005-2007	Career and Technical Education
	2005-2007	Office of Student and School Performance
	2005-2006	Division of Special Populations
	2005-2007	Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS)
		Business/Community Leaders
		Student, Parent
		National Drop-out Prevention Center
	National Center for Drop-out Prevention for Students with Disabilities	
	Exiting Community of Practice	

See also Indicator 1, Activity 1.5 for a related transition improvement strategy.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = # of districts meeting the state's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the state times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed.
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100).
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100).
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100).
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in *a* but not included in *b*, *c*, *d*, or *e* above

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a .

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed.
- b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100).
- c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100).
- d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100).
- e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a .

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) is composed of assessments in grades 3-11. The following content areas, English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, and social studies, are assessed at each grade. Criterion-referenced tests (CRT) are given at grades 4, 8, 10 and 11. Spring 2005 was the final year that norm-referenced tests (NRT), The Iowa Tests were given at grades 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 – Option II*, and 9. In Spring 2006, augmented criterion-referenced tests, or the *integrated LEAP* (LEAP), will be implemented in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9. The LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1) is for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Students must meet specific participation criteria to be assessed in LAA 1. *Option II 8th grade students (students passing one part of the LEAP 21 who were placed on a high school campus) had to retake the part of the LEAP 21 exam they failed, plus the students had to take all parts of The Iowa Tests at the ninth grade level. Spring 2005 was the final year for Option II.

LAA 1 is a substitute approach used in gathering information on the performance of students who do not participate in typical statewide assessments. LAA 1 has been specially designed to evaluate the progress of students with significant cognitive disabilities whose IEPs reflect significant modifications of the general education curriculum, and have an emphasis on functional and life skills. The LAA 1 is a performance-based student assessment that evaluates each student's knowledge and skills on selected Louisiana Content Standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. The student's performance is scored on an independence rubric (0-5) at one of three participation levels (introductory, fundamental or comprehensive). The participation levels reflect the level of difficulty at which a student performs skills related to each indicator.

In Spring 2006, the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2), for students with disabilities who have exhibited persistent academic disabilities in grades 4, 8, 10, and 11, will be also implemented. LAA 2 policy, based on modified academic achievement standards, allows students with persistent academic disabilities who are served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) to participate in academic assessments that are sensitive to measuring progress in their learning. LAA 2 is based on the state content standards and the grade-level expectations at the grades being assessed. English language arts and mathematics will be assessed in grades 4, 8, and 10. Students in grade 11 will be assessed in science and social studies. Additional grades and content areas will be phased in.

All students, including those with disabilities, participate in Louisiana's testing program. The scores of all students who participate in the CRT, NRT, LAA 1, or LAA 2 are included in the calculation of the School Performance Score (SPS). Students taking alternate assessments are included in accountability calculations at the grade level in which they are enrolled in the Student Information System (SIS). Students taking LAA 1 or LAA 2 who do not meet the participation criteria receive a score of *zero* in SPS component calculations and a score of *non-proficient* in subgroup component calculations.

Baseline Data for FFY 2003 (2003-2004):

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004: Measurement B - Participation Rate

Indicator 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade-level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.											
Statewide Assessment -- Spring 2005		Math Assessment					ELA Assessment				
		Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total		Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total	
					#	%				#	%
a	Children with IEPs in grades assessed	11034	7872	5834	24740		11036	7871	5818	24725	
b	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2426	967	820	4213	17.03%	2422	968	799	4189	16.94%
c	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	8064	6221	3881	18166	73.43%	8069	6224	3882	18175	73.51%
d	Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards*	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	498	591	946	2035	8.23%	498	594	950	2042	8.26%
	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	10988	7779	5647	24414	98.68%	10989	7786	5631	24406	98.71%
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above											
	Parental Exemptions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
	Absent	30	44	49	123		29	42	46	117	
	Not assessed for other reasons	16	49	138	203		18	43	141	202	

Baseline Data for FFY 2004: Measurement C - Proficiency Rate

Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade-level standards and alternate achievement standards											
Statewide Assessment -- Spring 2005		Math Assessment					ELA Assessment				
		Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total		Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total	
					#	%				#	%
a	Children with IEPs in grades assessed	11034	7872	5834	24740		11036	7871	5818	24725	
b	Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations	1401	310	174	1885	7.62%	1432	262	128	1822	7.37%
c	Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations	2302	845	514	3661	14.80%	1894	508	318	2720	11.00%
d	Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	Children with IEPs who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	287	405	674	1366	5.52%	365	492	774	1631	6.60%
	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	3990	1560	1362	6912	27.94%	3691	1262	1220	6173	24.97%

Discussion of Baseline Data:**Measurement:**

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

Participation Rate

All students (with and without disabilities) in grades 3-11 are required to participate in the statewide assessment. The majority of students with IEPs participating in the regular statewide assessment use accommodations. Louisiana's alternate assessment (LAA 1) is scored against alternate achievement standards for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) purposes only. Parents are not allowed to exempt students from the statewide assessment. If a student was absent during the assessment timeframe, documentation is required to indicate long-term illness, short-term illness, death of a family member, or that the student is in protective custody. Students who were tested and did not receive an accountability code are counted as *not assessed for other reasons*. There are two types of students that are counted in the *Not Assessed for Other Reasons*: 1) Students that did not take a test and the school did not provide an accountability (excuse) code, 2) Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in their first year of an English-speaking school, who were supposed to take a test but did not. The lowest score (zero) is given for these students, which is then aggregated and included for reporting.

Proficiency Rate

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

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
	Measurement A	Measurement B		Measurement C	
	Adequate Yearly Progress	Participation		Proficiency	
FFY		Mathematics	English Language arts	Mathematics	English Language arts
2005 (2005-2006)	68.1%	98.68%	98.71%	41.8%	47.4%
2006 (2006-2007)	70.0%	98.68%	98.71%	41.8%	47.4%
2007 (2007-2008)	73.5%	98.7%	98.75%	53.5%	57.9%
2008 (2008-2009)	75.5%	98.7%	98.75%	53.5%	57.9%
2009 (2009-2010)	80.0%	98.75%	98.78%	53.5%	57.9%
2010 (2010-2011)	85.0%	98.75%	98.8%	65.2%	68.4%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 3.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>Develop and implement instructional methods and strategies that are responsive to the needs of all students and enhance the performance of students with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize a stakeholder group (linked to the stakeholder review groups referenced in Indicator 5) to review policies, procedures, and practices that facilitate or create barriers to implementation of research-based instructional practices for all students with disabilities. The review will include but not be limited to school improvement, accountability, assessment, administrators, special education, higher education, teacher quality/certification, and professional development. 	2006-2007	<p>Facilitated by outside consultant(s)</p> <p>Personnel from multiple LDE Divisions (e.g., Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards and Assessments; Professional Development; Teacher Certification and Higher Education; Division of School and Community Support)</p> <p>Regional Education Service Centers</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>Validated Practices (VP) Initiative</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify common barriers and facilitators to implementing research-based instructional strategies Train stakeholder group to look for these common elements in policies and procedures Identify strategies to remove barriers and strengthen facilitators Submit the group’s recommendations for changes to the appropriate audience (e.g., State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, Council of Deans, Special Education Advisory Council). <p>Note: Link the work of this stakeholder group to others noted in the SPP established to review policies, practices, and procedures.</p> <p>Revise the <i>General Education Access Guide</i></p>	<p>2006</p>	<p>VP Initiative Stakeholder Group</p> <p>The Access Center</p> <p>National TA Center on Assessment for Children with Disabilities</p> <p>OESE Center on Assessment and Accountability</p> <p>National Alternate Assessment Center</p> <p>National Center on Student Progress Monitoring</p> <p>LDE and LEA stakeholders</p>
<p>A cross-department team led by the Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance from the LDE, in collaboration with stakeholders [e.g., Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), families], will plan for coherent dissemination, implementation, and sustainability of Response to Intervention (RtI). This plan will include integration with already existing models of intervention/instruction, [e.g., Reading First, Positive Behavior Support (PBS), Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), Learning Initiative Networking Communities for Success (LINCS), significant disability literacy initiative].</p>	<p>2005-2011</p>	<p>General Education Access Guide</p> <p>Access Center</p> <p>Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ)</p> <p>SIM Professional Developers</p> <p>National web seminars</p> <p>Validated Practices professional development sites</p> <p>Louisiana Statewide Improvement Grant (LaSIG) district/school sites</p> <p>Professional development sites (e.g., Reading First, RtI, PBS, LINCS, IHE professional development site schools)</p>
<p>Develop a process for working on improvement efforts with selected districts (based upon their ranking on key indicators for students with disabilities such as performance, placement, suspensions/expulsions, and diploma rates). The process will include a comprehensive review of a district’s policies and practices to identify barriers and facilitators of improvement.</p> <p>Partner with stakeholders in the design, implementation, and sustainability of an improvement plan focused on both district and building level activities. Promote data-driven decision-making within these sites. Supports will</p>	<p>2006-2007</p> <p>2007-2011 Begin with two districts in</p>	<p>SPDG</p> <p>LaSIG schools</p> <p>VP Initiative</p> <p>PBS Initiative</p> <p>PTIs/CPRC, families</p> <p>IHEs</p>

<p>include ongoing coaching and mentoring, professional learning communities, and linkage with existing reform efforts. Ensure that, over time, sites selected include urban, rural, suburban areas, and all educational regions of the state.</p> <p>(See also Indicator 5, Activity 5.1.)</p>	<p>the initial year, and add districts on an annual basis</p>	
<p>Establish a middle and high school initiative that partners with state, district, and local stakeholders. This initiative includes the design, implementation, and sustainability of an improvement plan, which focuses on improved performance of students with disabilities using research-based strategies to close achievement gaps. Promote data-driven decision-making within these sites. Supports will include ongoing coaching and mentoring, professional learning communities, and linkage with existing reform efforts. Ensure that, over time, sites selected include urban, rural, suburban areas, and all educational regions of the state.</p>	<p>2007-2011</p>	<p>VP, LaSIG, and PBS Initiative sites</p> <p>IHE partnerships</p> <p>LCET</p> <p>NCSD standards</p> <p>High School reform</p> <p>LDE Transition staff</p> <p>Distinguished Educators</p> <p>LINCS</p> <p>RESCs</p> <p>VP research results</p> <p>National resources (e.g., Research Institute to Accelerate Content Learning through High Support for Students with Disabilities in Grades 4-8, Center for Improving Teacher Quality, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) Center on Teacher Quality)</p>
<p>Continue efforts to build the infrastructure for a Low Incidence Consortium that will guide pre-service and in-service personnel preparation activities. Use the Consortium and related groups to guide the professional development agenda (e.g., collaboration, teaming, access to the general education curriculum, instructional strategies, communication, positive behavioral support, disability specific support) of personnel serving these students and evaluate the impact of the effort.</p>	<p>2005-2011</p>	<p>Significant Disabilities Leadership Committee</p> <p>Deaf-blind Grant</p> <p>IHEs</p> <p>PTI</p> <p>Sensorially Impaired Advisory Committee</p> <p>LA Commission for the Deaf</p> <p>LA State Advisory Council of Early Identification of Hearing Impairments</p> <p>Access Center</p>

Improvement Activity 3.2	Timelines	Resources
<p>Develop and implement a four-year process for schoolwide implementation of the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). The four components are described below:</p> <p>Component 1: Awareness/Exploration of SIM and the Content Literacy Continuum (CLC) District and building level stakeholders (i.e., principal, lead teachers, special educator) become aware or deepen awareness of SIM and its potential impact for improving the performance of students with disabilities.</p> <p>The district and school are willing to commit to support the implementation and sustainability of SIM, including SIM in the individual school improvement plans.</p> <p>The school(s) has (have) a culture of collaboration across departments, administration and faculty work together in a healthy climate, and the school is committed to data-based decision-making.</p> <p>Schools will be chosen by an application process. <i>Cohort 1 will include 4 sites.</i> <i>Cohort 2 will add an additional 8 sites (one per region).</i> <i>In subsequent years, Cohorts 3-6 will add an additional 16 schools each year (two per region).</i></p>	<p>Cohort 1 2005-06</p> <p>Cohort 2 2006-07</p> <p>Cohort 3 2007-08</p> <p>Cohort 4 2008-09</p> <p>Cohort 5 2009-10</p> <p>Cohort 6 2010-11</p>	<p>LDE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p>
<p>Component 2: Planning Partnerships are established amongst district and school leaders, LDE, RESC, SIM professional developers, SIM coaches/mentors, and families. The school infrastructure, student data, school conditions, teacher needs, and teacher concerns are assessed (Safety and discipline concerns are NOT the major thrust of the School Improvement Plan).</p> <p>SIM professional development and implementation plans follow the National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards.</p> <p>Supported SIM professional development begins or continues</p>	<p>Cohort 1 2005-06</p> <p>Cohort 2 2006-07</p> <p>Cohort 3 2007-08</p> <p>Cohort 4 2008-09</p> <p>Cohort 5 2009-10</p> <p>Cohort 6 2010-11</p>	<p>LDE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p> <p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p>
<p>Component 3: Implementation Infrastructure is nurtured; there is ongoing PD and support including the dialogue and discussion in Professional Learning Communities (PLC).</p> <p>Formative student performance data is collected and analyzed.</p> <p>SIM site-based professional developers and expert teacher leaders are cultivated.</p>	<p>Cohort 1 2006-07</p> <p>Cohorts 1-2 2007-08</p> <p>Cohorts 1-3 2008-09</p>	<p>LDE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p>

	<p>Cohorts 1-4 2009-10</p> <p>Cohorts 1-5 2010-11</p>	<p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p> <p>PLC</p> <p>Access Center</p>
<p>Component 4: Sustaining The induction of site-based professional developers and teacher leaders sustain implementation with fidelity, mentor novice teachers, build critical mass, and oversee site-based planning for implementation at all levels of the school.</p> <p>Connections and relationships are made with other districts schools' practices (e.g., feeder schools).</p> <p>Formative and summative student performance data is collected and analyzed.</p>	<p>Cohort 1 2008-09</p> <p>Cohorts 1-2 2009-10</p> <p>Cohorts 1-3 2010-11</p>	<p>LDE</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>SIM certified professional developers</p> <p>District and school leadership personnel</p> <p>Coaches/mentors</p> <p>National Council of Staff Development (NCSD) standards</p> <p>SIM materials</p> <p>PLC</p>

SIM School-Wide Implementation Summary Chart

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Awareness	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	Cohort 5	Cohort 6
Planning	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	Cohort 5	Cohort 6
Implementation		Cohort 1	Cohorts 1-2	Cohorts 1-3	Cohorts 1-4	Cohort 1-5
Sustaining				Cohorts 1	Cohorts 1-2	Cohorts 1-3

Improvement Activity 3.3	Timelines	Resources
<p>Amend and implement accommodations manual and professional development for accommodations manual to assist teachers in selecting, administering and evaluating the uses of accommodations for instruction and assessment of students with disabilities:</p> <p>Develop an Accommodations Manual, using template developed by CCSSO/SCASS/ Assessing Special Education Students (ASES). Insert state-specific information on legislation, regulations and policy.</p> <p>Develop Accommodations Manual for Professional Development Guide with PowerPoint presentation that are</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>LDE personnel across multiple divisions (e.g., Special Populations, Student Standards and Assessments, Professional Development, School and Community Support)</p>

companion documents for the <i>Accommodations Manual</i>		
Establish a team to review and revise, if necessary, the <i>Accommodations Manual</i> (to specifically address accommodation categories, accommodation conditions, and accommodations used in statewide assessment), the <i>Professional Development Guide</i> , and PowerPoint presentation companion documents to address compatibility with the <i>Accommodations Manual</i> .	2006	LDE Personnel from multiple divisions Personnel from Regional Service Centers (RSC) Personnel from select LEAs and schools
Design and implement professional development for school districts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation of PD 	2006	LDE personnel
After statewide assessment is administered, analyze data trends on students with IEPs and students with 504 plans to determine if the manual and related professional development were effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % receiving accommodations ▪ % not receiving accommodations ▪ % achieving proficiency 	2007	LDE personnel from multiple divisions
Send end-of-year survey to a sample of teachers to determine the usefulness of the <i>Accommodations Manual</i> .	2007	LDE personnel from multiple divisions
Reconvene the team to review teacher surveys and revise, if necessary, the <i>Accommodations Manual</i> , <i>Professional Development Guide</i> , and/or the PowerPoint presentation. Coordinate accommodations activities (See also Indicator 1, Activity 1.1, where this activity also applies).	2007	Personnel from multiple LDE Divisions, Regional Service Centers, select LEAs and schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the state as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the state as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of districts identified by the state as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the state times 100.
- B. Percent = # of districts identified by the state as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the state times 100.

Include state’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

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

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Indicator 4.B. Because this is a new indicator, baseline data will be reported in Louisiana’s February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	24.1%
2006 (2006-2007)	21.5%
2007 (2007-2008)	19.0%
2008 (2008-2009)	16.5%
2009 (2009-2010)	13.9%
2010 (2010-2011)	11.4%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 4.1	Timelines	Resources
<p><u>Review LDE policies</u> and make necessary adjustments with regard to addressing long-term disciplinary removal of students with disabilities. <u>Review policies of LEAs</u> with significant discrepancies in the number/percentage of students with disabilities removed for more than 10 days, and have LEAs revise the policies accordingly.</p> <p>1) Continue to review state statutes and LDE policies.</p> <p>2) Make recommendations to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Louisiana Legislature for the removal of any language that contribute to the use of removal or punitive measures as disciplinary actions and recommend the inclusion of language that ensures positive educational approaches are considered, including but not limited to:</p> <p>Review La. R.S. 17:416 and <i>Bulletin 741</i> and make recommendations to BESE and the state legislature that changes are made to reflect current best practices and humane treatment of children and youth, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of information contained on state office discipline form to recommend the inclusion of all data relevant for school and student level analysis. Review policies related to the use of corporal punishment and recommend all such policies are banned as a disciplinary option. Review to recommend the inclusion of disciplinary procedures that include positive, educationally oriented approaches and do not limit administrators to punitive disciplinary measures. Review for language that impacts student access to education based on lack of parental involvement and/or inaction and recommend the removal of any such language. Review for language that requires expulsion other than for possession of weapons, controlled substances and/or behavior that results or threatens serious bodily injury and recommend the removal of such language. 	<p>2005-2007</p> <p>June 2006</p> <p>Sept. 2006</p>	<p>State Department of Education:</p> <p>Division of School & Community Support</p> <p>Regional Service Centers</p> <p>Division of School Standards, Accountability and Assistance</p> <p>Division of Special Populations</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>PBS Initiative</p>
<p>2) Develop an instrument that evaluates LEA policies in relation to LDE’s Model Master Discipline Plan (MMDP). The LDE’s Model Master Discipline Plan was recently adopted and is expected to serve as a foundation to identify and create LEA policies that result in appropriate (and reduced) use of removal as a disciplinary action.</p>	<p>June 2006</p>	<p>LDE Staff</p>
<p>3) Review policies of at least 25% of LEAs per year identified as having significant discrepancies with the long-term removals of students with disabilities from the most recent data available. The instrument described in number 2 of this activity will be</p>	<p>June 2006</p> <p>June 2007</p> <p>June 2008</p> <p>June 2009</p>	<p>Same resources as Activity 1</p>

<p>used to evaluate these LEA policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify LEA policies inconsistent with SDE MMDP. Identify connection of removal of students to LEA policies. 	<p>June 2010 June 2011</p>	
<p>4) Assist identified LEAs with developing policies consistent with LDE Model Master Discipline Plan by meeting with and addressing any issues identified with LEA policy that interferes with appropriate procedures and best practices related to discipline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDE will meet with LEA superintendent and discipline committee and provide feedback on policies and assistance with revisions. <p>(See also Indicator 3, Activities 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3)</p>	<p>2005-2011</p>	<p>Same resources as Activity 1</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 4.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p><u>LDE will review LDE procedures</u> and make necessary adjustments with regard to addressing long-term disciplinary removal of students with disabilities. LDE will <u>review procedures of LEAs</u> with significant discrepancies in the number/percentage of students with disabilities removed for more than 10 days. LDE will assist and require LEAs in making necessary revisions to their procedures.</p> <p>LDE will increase identification of targeted need areas through the use of data management procedures. LDE will review data to identify LEAs with significant discrepancies in the use of long-term removals of students with disabilities. LDE will provide training and assistance and LDE will monitor for compliance.</p>	<p>June 2006 June 2007 June 2008 June 2009 June 2010 June 2011</p>	<p>Same resources as Activity 4.1</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 4.3</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p><u>LDE will review LDE practices</u> and make necessary adjustments with regard to addressing long-term disciplinary removal of students with disabilities.</p> <p>1) LDE will <u>review practices of LEAs</u> with significant discrepancies in the number/percentage of students with disabilities removed for more than 10 days.</p> <p>2) LDE will require and assist LEAs in making necessary revisions to their practices.</p> <p>3) LDE will increase the level of implementation of Positive Behavioral</p>	<p>June 2006 June 2007 June 2008 June 2009 June 2010 June 2011</p> <p>Dec. 2006 Dec. 2007 Dec. 2008 Dec. 2009 Dec. 2010 Dec. 2011</p> <p>Dec. 2006</p>	<p>Same resources as Activity 4.1</p> <p>Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports</p> <p>National Dropout Prevention Centers</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

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

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

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

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

	Outside Regular Class less than 21% of the Day		Outside Regular Class 21-60% of the Day		Outside Regular Class more than 60% of the Day		Public or Private Separate Schools, Residential Placements, or Homebound or Hospital Placements		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Ages 6-11	27413	63.86%	8738	20.36%	6364	14.82%	413	.96%	42928
Ages 12-17	18472	43.74%	12843	30.41%	9736	23.05%	1181	2.79%	42232
Ages 18-21	2246	41.33%	1364	25.10%	1376	25.32%	448	8.24%	5434

Source: December 1, 2004 IDEA Count

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

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

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

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

	Measurable and Rigorous Targets		
FFY	Goal A	Goal B	Goal C
2005 (2005-2006)	55.30%	17.70%	2.22%
2006 (2006-2007)	57.76%	16.11%	2.19%
2007 (2007-2008)	60.22%	14.53%	2.17%
2008 (2008-2009)	62.69%	12.94%	2.14%
2009 (2009-2010)	65.15%	11.35%	2.11%
2010 (2010-2011)	67.61%	9.76%	2.08%

<p>engaged in systemic improvement efforts. Select districts based upon identified criteria, along with geographic and demographic considerations. Link with these to develop inclusive practices sites that result in improved outcomes for all students (e.g., success in closing the achievement gap). Ensure that both high incidence and low incidence disability issues are addressed, along with issues appropriate to reduction of placement in the most restrictive settings (i.e., self-contained setting, separate site setting). Promote data-driven decision making within the sites. Provide support to these sites both internally and externally. Utilize learning communities, coaching, and mentoring to support and sustain change.</p> <p>These identified sites will be used to inform policy, professional development, and practice and serve as demonstration sites for other schools and districts. Develop supports for personnel statewide to access information about the policies, practices, and procedures of these sites that exhibit authentic school improvement.</p> <p>Write the “story” of achieving demonstration sites complete with elements necessary for success and communicate that message statewide through web campaigns.</p> <p>(Also, see Indicator 3, Improvement Activity 3.1.)</p>	<p>add sites annually</p>	<p>Process – Revised (SIP-R); SWPBS Strategist Group (SIG); Family School Linkages (SIG); PTIs; CPRC; families; IHEs; Distinguished Schools; Louisiana Center for Educational Technology (LCET); Teaching and Learning Technology Centers (TLTC); Learning communities; VP Initiative website</p>
<p>Improvement Activity 5.2</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Establish mechanisms, policies, resources and professional development to create collaborative school cultures that enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>Organize a stakeholder group (linked to the stakeholder review group referenced in Improvement Activity 5.1 to review and evaluate policies, procedures, and practices that facilitate or create barriers to collaborative/inclusive school cultures that enhance the LRE placement and performance of all students with disabilities. A collaborative school culture is one that based on mutual goals, shared responsibility for participation, sharing of resources, and sharing of accountability for outcomes (Friend & Cook, 2003). The review will include but not be limited to school improvement, accountability, assessment, administrators, special education, higher education, teacher quality/certification, professional development. Specific examples include policies/procedures/practices related to highly qualified personnel, pupil/teacher ratio structure, school and district report cards, professional development agendas, teacher assessment, preschool and adult transition, and parental involvement and support.</p> <p>Review other states’ policies, procedures, and practices (outside consultants, identified other states) that facilitate</p>	<p>2006-08</p>	<p>Facilitated by outside consultant(s)</p> <p>Personnel from multiple LDE Divisions (e.g., Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards and Assessments; Professional Development; Teacher Certification and Higher Education)</p> <p>RESC</p> <p>Personnel from select LEAs and schools</p> <p>IHEs</p> <p>Families</p> <p>VP Initiative Stakeholder Group</p>

<p>collaborative/inclusive school cultures as a means of informing policies, procedures, and practices in Louisiana.</p>		<p>SPDG</p>
<p>Establish a coherent professional development plan to create collaborative school cultures. This will be planned and implemented by a cross department team representing multiple Divisions (e.g., Special Populations; School Standards, Accountability and Assistance; Student Standards and Assessments; Professional Development), RESCs, IHEs, LEAs, and families. This will include integration with already existing models of intervention/ instruction, (e.g., Reading First, Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support [SWPBS], Strategic Instruction Model [SIM]). The following components will be addressed:</p> <p><u>Participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-level personnel • Administrators, school leaders, teacher leaders • Practitioners • Family members and community members <p><u>Framework:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative and joint professional development (PD) for regular and special educators. • Use of technology (e.g., web sites, compressed video) Research/evidence based strategies. • Allocated funds for ongoing job embedded PD according to National Staff Development Council (NSDC) standards and inclusion in the SIP. • Evaluation of current practices. • Mentoring/demonstration sites (e.g., PBS, VP, SIG). • Ages 3-5 evaluation of classroom practices using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R). • Work in targeted middle/high schools. • Professional learning communities. <p><u>Content: (examples, not limited to)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive practices • Co-Planning • Co-Teaching • Collaboration • Teaming • Data/trend analysis • Differentiated Instruction • Universal Design for Learning (UDL) • Family involvement and linkages • Support for low incidence personnel • Organizational structures, use of resources (human and financial) 	<p>2006-2011 Add additional sites annually</p>	<p>Link with Scholastic Audit findings (closing achievement gaps)</p> <p>TLTC</p> <p>Assistive Technology Centers</p> <p>LaSIG and SPDG for coaching and on-site support</p> <p>PTIs, CPRC, families</p> <p>Family Leadership Academies (SIG)</p> <p>VP Initiative website</p> <p>Audio/PD conference calls</p> <p>PBS initiative (PD, schools, web site)</p> <p>Online PD through LCET</p> <p>SIP-R</p> <p>LaSIG tools</p> <p>LINCS PD and schools</p> <p>Reading First, Response to Intervention (RTI)</p> <p>SPDG</p> <p>FHF Family Resource Centers</p> <p>National Institute for Urban School Improvement</p> <p>Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Center on Instruction</p> <p>The Access Center</p> <p>National Center for Special Education Accountability</p>

		Monitoring
Expand current public relations campaign to disseminate information related to state performance plan indicators and activities, state goals, demonstration sites using research-based practices to close achievement gaps, and availability of ongoing technical assistance and professional development opportunities.	2006-2011	LDE Communications Office Marketing Specialist
Improvement Activity 5.3	Timelines	Resources
Create partnerships and frameworks amongst IHEs, LDE, LEAs, and community members to provide high quality education professionals that will create inclusive schools that enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Align/refine programs related to the newly approved redesigned general education-special education mild/moderate blended program (e.g., alternate path, Practitioner II program, add-on).	Spring 2006	Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) Access Center
Host IHE, LDE, LEA and family partnership forum to address strategies for ensuring a highly qualified personnel work force. Utilize this forum to identify a mechanism for ongoing communication (e.g., types, frequency, function) amongst partners, identify short and long term priorities, recommend use of funds, etc. Research effective professional development school (PDS) models. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reexamine the factors contributing to PDS scores. Establish website for posting effective strategies for supporting and nurturing IHE and PDS partnerships. 	Spring 2006 2006-07	SIG, FHF, CPRC, IHEs, SERCC, CTQ VP Initiative, IHEs, CTQ
Use the partnership forum to serve as the launch for the 1) development, implementation, and evaluation of Professional Development Sites (PDS) and Professional Development Classrooms (PDC), and 2) recruitment and retention efforts. The forum will make recommendations regarding funding, structure, creation of incentives and supports to establish PDS and PDCs, etc. Embed this model into the new SPDG application in the spring.	2006-07 and ongoing	SIG FHF, CPRC SPDG IHEs SERCC CTQ LEAs VP Initiative
Use PDS and PDC sites for both initial certification and professional development purposes. Support these sites through Validated Practices Initiative and SPDG funds. Utilize sites to identify successful inclusive practices and evaluate associated outcomes for learners as well as to implement other specific initiatives of the department (e.g., Rtl). Include coordination of this activity with the “oversight” committee noted in Improvement Activity #1.	2006 and ongoing	SIG FHF, CPRC SPDG IHEs SERCC CTQ LEAs VP Initiative

Establish a long-term “Think Tank” committee to support the effort to identify, develop, implement and evaluate recruitment and retention models that blend state, local and IHE resources. Identify funding sources to recruit, retain, and support skilled personnel.	2006 and ongoing	SPDG, IHEs, VP, LEAs, PTI, families, outside consultant
Implement, enhance and evaluate a mentoring program to expose high school juniors and seniors to the teaching profession. Link to Teacher Cadet Program.	2007	IHEs, LDE
Establish incentives and structures for local cooperative agreements between LEAs and IHEs regarding recruitment, selection, and induction to support new teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure newly hired teachers without appropriate certification meet requirements for admission into teacher education programs. • Investigate models from other states for joint (LEA and IHE) selection of non-certified candidates. • Assign new recruits to specific jobs. 	2008-2009	IHEs, LEAs
Create business and community partnerships around specific needs identified by stakeholders, e.g., transition specialists in smaller communities.	2009-2010	VP Initiative LDE
Continue efforts to establish/support the Low Incidence Consortium to guide pre-service and in-service personnel preparation for low incidence disability areas.	2006 and ongoing	LDE, IHEs, SPDG, PTI, families, LEA

Implementation Summary Chart

		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Systemic process for change	policy review		X	X			
	criteria tool		X				
	demo sites		X	X	X	X	X
	coordination	X	X	X	X	X	X
Collaborative school culture	policy review		X	X			
	professional development		X	X	X	X	X
	dissemination		X	X	X	X	X
	Public relations campaign	X	X	X	X	X	X
High quality teacher preparation and professional development/ in-service	program alignment/refinement		X				
	forum & think tank		X	X	X	X	X
	PDS/PDC		X	X	X	X	X
	mentoring program			X	X	X	X
	recruit support		X	X	X	X	X
	Low Incidence Consortium		X	X	X	X	X

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In Louisiana, children with disabilities have historically been served in Early Childhood Special Education Settings (self-contained) at ages 3-5. In 2001-2002, Louisiana began concentrating technical assistance to LEAs statewide to assist them in serving children in settings with typical peers and in their natural environment, including childcare facilities, Head Start programs and at home. During 2003-2004, FAPE in the LRE in Early Childhood Special Education was a focus for the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process. These activities have had a positive impact on the inclusive placement of preschool children.

Improvement activities, timelines and resources were developed during LRE workgroup sessions that addressed issues of placement and performance for children ages 3-21. Three main improvement activities were identified that would be applicable for all children and youth with disabilities, ages 3-21. The specific activities, timelines and resources can be found outlined in detail in Indicator 5. A group of Early Childhood Stakeholders will work closely with the Validated Practices Initiative to ensure placement is made so that no child is removed from settings with typical peers unless supports and services are impossible to deliver in the inclusive setting.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings) is 40.17%. Table 6.1 shows trend data for this setting.

Table 6.1

Dec. 1, 2003		Dec. 1, 2004 Baseline Data	
n	%	n	%
4645	40.80%	4782	40.17%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The percentages reported in this section differ from those in the March 2005 APR; the SPP reflects 618 data as submitted to OSEP and includes private schools, while the APR data were for public schools only. There was a 7.41% increase from 2002 to 2003 in children served in the least restrictive environment. It was during this time that intensive technical assistance was given to the LEAs in serving children in settings other than the “self-contained” class, especially 3-year-olds in the

natural environment and 4-year-olds in public PreK classes. From 2003-2004 there was a decrease of .63% which can be explained by Louisiana’s use of the optional settings of Itinerant Service Outside the Home and Reverse Mainstream for reporting to OSEP. Each of these settings includes serving the child with typically developing peers.

Table 6.2 gives two years of data of all Early Childhood Settings for children, ages 3-5, as reported to OSEP, including the optional settings of Itinerant Service Outside the Home and Reverse Mainstream.

Table 6.2

Educational Environment	Dec. 1, 2003		Dec. 1, 2004	
	n	%	n	%
Early Childhood Setting	2,857	25.09%	2,938	24.68%
Early Childhood Special Education Setting	3,313	29.10%	3,282	27.57%
Home	285	2.50%	290	2.44%
Part-Time EC/Part-Time ECSE	1,503	13.20%	1,554	13.05%
Residential Facility	6	0.05%	7	0.06%
Separate School	18	0.16%	16	0.13%
Itinerant Service Outside the Home	3,323	29.18%	3,673	30.86%
Reverse Mainstream Setting	81	0.71%	144	1.21%
Total	11,386		11,904	

Data Source: 618 data (Part B, IDEA Implementation of FAPE Requirement, Educational Environment of Children with Disabilities Ages 3-5)

State Improvement Goal: Acknowledging that placement is a decision individually made for each student based on IEP Committee identified needs, increase percentage of children served in early Childhood Education Settings to 61.71% by 2011. These settings include Early Childhood Education, Home and Part-Time Early Childhood/Part-Time Early Childhood Special Education.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	41.67%
2006 (2006-2007)	44.00%
2007 (2007-2008)	48.43%
2008 (2008-2009)	52.86%

2009 (2009-2010)	57.29%
2010 (2010-2011)	61.71%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 6.1	Timelines	Resources
<p>Engage in a systemic process for creating and sustaining change at the state, district and building levels that includes frameworks and supports to enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>(See also Indicator 5, Improvement Activity 5.1, for activities, timelines and resources.)</p>		<p>Preschool LRE Community of Practice</p> <p>National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center</p>
Improvement Activity 6.2	Timelines	Resources
<p>Establish mechanisms, policies, resources and professional development to create collaborative school cultures that enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>(See also Indicator 5, Improvement Activity 5.2, for activities, timelines and resources.)</p>		<p>Preschool LRE Community of Practice</p> <p>National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center</p>
Improvement Activity 6.3	Timelines	Resources
<p>Create partnerships and frameworks amongst IHEs, LDE, LEAs, and community members to provide high quality education professionals that will create inclusive schools that enhance the performance and placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>(See also Indicator 5, Improvement Activity 5.3, for activities, timelines and resources.)</p>		<p>Preschool LRE Community of Practice</p> <p>National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center</p>

Implementation Summary

		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Systemic process for change	policy review		X	X			
	criteria tool		X				
	demo sites		X	X	X	X	X
	coordination	X	X	X	X	X	X
Collaborative school culture	policy review		X	X			
	professional development		X	X	X	X	X
	dissemination		X	X	X	X	X
	public relations campaign	X	X	X	X	X	X
High quality teacher preparation and professional development/ In-service	program alignment/refinement		X				
	forum & think tank		X	X	X	X	X
	PDS/PDC		X	X	X	X	X
	mentoring program			X	X	X	X
	recruit support		X	X	X	X	X
	Low Incidence Consortium		X	X	X	X	X

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

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

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If

a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator.

In order to address Indicator 7 in the monitoring priority area of FAPE in the LRE, an Assessment Task Force was formed in August 2004. Stakeholders participating on the task force and involved in making determinations are IDEA staff, Section 619 Coordinator, Regional Early Childhood Special Education Coordinators, university personnel, Part C staff, Head Start Coordinator, family members, Early Interventionists - Part C and Part B and LEA personnel. This task force has been guided by nationally recognized consultants who have assisted the group on-site in researching assessment tools. A recommendation was made to use the comprehensive Assessment, Evaluation, Program System (AEPS) during the 2005-2006 school year. A required training in how to administer the AEPS will be provided for a team from each LEA during December 2005, and the AEPS will be administered in Spring 2006 to all students entering preschool programs.

During the 2006-2007 school year, the AEPS will be administered to all students exiting preschool programs as well as to all students who enter preschool programs during the year. When data for each individual student who entered preschool programs in 2005-2006 is compared with data for the year of exit, the percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improvement will be determined. Data fields have been added to SER to capture entry and exit assessment scores for each child in each of the measurement areas.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Status data for entry assessment will be reported in the February 2007 Annual Performance Report, and baseline data will be reported in February 2008.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator.

LDE contracted to develop a comprehensive process for sampling and administering the NCSEAM Parent Survey on Special Education. The contract proposal for this process was prepared and delivered to the department in November 2005. LDE and the contractor will administer the Parent Survey on Special Education from NCSEAM in cooperation with the network of nine Families Helping Families (FHF) family resource centers statewide. Parents will be polled on their overall impression of whether schools facilitated their meaningful involvement in the services and supports provided for children with disabilities across all atmospheres in the school.

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*. The sampling plan is included with this report.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include state's definition of "disproportionate representation."
--

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on Dec. 1, 2003 and Dec. 1, 2004, IDEA Part B 618 data

Disproportionate representation of Black students in special education and related services continues to be above 1.0. Louisiana stakeholders met in January 2005 and set 1.5 cut-off values, with a minimum cell size of 10, for significant disproportionality to trigger further review, evaluation, and monitoring in that area. Since language has changed in the current report to identify disproportionate representation rather than significant disproportionality, Louisiana is choosing to continue to use the cut-off score of 1.5 or greater to define disproportionate representation. Whereas Louisiana's state-level risk ratio is not greater than 1.5 in any specific race/ethnic category, Louisiana does have LEAs in which the risk ratio for Black students in special education and related services is greater than or equal to 1.5.

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

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

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

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

Identified districts that continue to display a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 1.5 will be directed to complete a district-level analysis of policies, procedures and practices and would include the

submission of district-level policies and procedures pertaining to building-level identification and intervention and the special education referral, evaluation and determination process. In addition, the state may request copies of individual evaluations to review for discrepancies in the implementation of *Bulletin 1508, Pupil Appraisal Handbook*. A state team will review the documents and determine if the disproportionality data are the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data for this indicator will be reported in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the state times 100.

Include state’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator area. For an Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process, see paragraphs one through three of Indicator Nine.

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

Table 10.1 2003-2004 Risk Ratio Data by Disability Category

Race/ Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Black (Not Hispanic)		Hispanic		White (Not Hispanic)	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Mental Retardation	0.67	0.59	0.27	0.28	2.53	2.53	0.32	0.32	0.43	0.43
Specific Learning Disabilities	1.28	1.22	0.19	0.17	1.50	1.55	0.60	0.58	0.71	0.69
Emotional Disturbance	0.60	0.61	0.03*	0.08*	2.41	2.26	0.42	0.37	0.46	0.49

Speech or Language Impairments	0.94	1.03	0.62	0.59	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.84	1.35	1.35
Other Health Impairments	0.80	0.68	0.15	0.18	0.64	0.65	0.58	0.49	1.70	1.67
Autism	0.26*	0.29*	1.21	1.35	1.00	0.94	0.76	0.73	1.03	1.09

* Cell size less than 10

Based on Dec. 1, 2003 and Dec. 1, 2004, IDEA Part B 618 data

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

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

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

Louisiana has chosen to focus on over-representation in disability categories, while acknowledging the need for further study of the under-representation of the Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic populations to ensure that these groups are receiving equal access to special education services. The stakeholder committee did not set limits for the point at which risk ratio less than 1.0 would be considered significant. Louisiana has specific outreach to these groups through the development and distribution of Child Find posters and brochures in Spanish and Vietnamese. Louisiana has also recently developed a *Guideline for Assessing English Language Learners* that may impact members of this population. LDE will further analyze data surrounding the delivery of services to these populations.

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

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

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

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Baseline data will be reported for this indicator in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or state-established timeline).

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or state-established timeline). # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or state-established timeline). <p>Account for children included in <i>a</i> but not included in <i>b</i> or <i>c</i>. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = $b + c$ divided by a times 100.</p>

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator area.

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

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

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

Due to the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, data collected for this indicator for FFY 2005-2006 will be skewed. A number of affected school districts will be functioning for only a portion of the FFY 2005-2006 or will not reopen at all during FFY 2005-2006.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data for this indicator area will be reported in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*. Although Louisiana maintains an electronic data collection process which collects information on the timeliness of evaluations, the data collected during 2004-2005 does not address the measurement formula for this report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays is 31.62%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Table 12.1

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

	n	%
IEP by the 3rd Birthday	647	31.62%
IEP after 3rd Birthday	1399	68.38%
TOTAL	2046	

Data in Table 12.1 reflect information from the Louisiana Special Education Records (LANSER) obtained in June 2005. The data do not specify which children had previously received Part C

services or if children had been referred after their third birthdays. The new data system, Special Education Records (SER), begun in August 2005, collects information which clarifies whether children had been receiving services in Part C and were transitioning to Part B.

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activity 12.1 (2005-2006)	Timelines	Resources
Add fields to Special Education Reporting (SER) to capture: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date LEA received transition meeting notice • Date LEA attended Transition Meeting 	Aug. 2005	619 Coordinator SER Data Management personnel
Collaborative Meeting with Department of Health and Hospitals (DHH)/Early Steps Program, Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD) and LDE regarding transition from IDEA Part C to Part B and Medicaid Waiver program.	Aug. 2005	DHH/Early Steps OCDD DOE ECSE Stakeholder group
Meet with DHH/Part C to request list of children in Part C who are 2 years, 2 months of age.	Oct. 2005	DHH/Early Steps DOE
Develop Informational brochure on Transition from Part C to Part B.	Oct. 2005	619 Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Team
Develop and conduct informational meeting with LEA. Special Education Supervisors/Directors and LEA	Nov. 2005 and thereafter,	

<p>Preschool Coordinators. Distribute Transition Brochure and Q and A on Transition Policy from Part C to Part B.</p> <p>Review 2 year, 2 month, monthly report from DHH/Early Steps; distribute to ECSE Regional Coordinators; ECSE Coordinators collaborate with LEAs to ensure list is received from DHH/Early Steps.</p> <p>Monitor LEA to ensure compliance in entering data into SER in timely manner. No longer than 2 weeks of occurrence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date transition meeting notice received • Date of attendance at transition meeting • Date of evaluation dissemination • Date of IEP <p>Follow-up non-compliance with actions: First non-Compliance: Phone call to Preschool Coordinator, Pupil Appraisal, ECSE Regional Coordinators. Second non-compliance: 1) Letter to Superintendents from Cecil Picard; 2) Copy letter to Special Ed Director/ Supervisor, Preschool Coordinator, Pupil Appraisal, ECSE Regional Coordinators; 3) LEA will be required to submit a Corrective Action Plan within one month of notification of second non-compliance.</p> <p>Revise, re-publish and distribute <i>Early Childhood Transition Process Family Booklet</i> to empower families to be engaged in their children’s educational decisions.</p> <p>Conduct 8 Regional TA meetings to review policies and regulations for IDEA Part C, IDEA Part B and OCDD. Develop a fact sheet and distribute at meetings.</p> <p>Meet with stakeholder group, which includes families, to discuss ways to offer a smooth and effective transition from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B for children turning three during the spring and summer months.</p>	<p>at quarterly meetings</p> <p>Dec. 2005, Monthly, thereafter</p> <p>Jan. 2006, Monthly, thereafter</p> <p>Jan. 2006, Monthly, thereafter</p> <p>Spring 2006</p> <p>Spring 2006</p> <p>Spring 2006</p>	<p>LDE’s Office of Communications 619 ECSE Team</p> <p>DHH/Early Steps 619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA preschool personnel</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA data entry personnel LEA preschool coordinator</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators LEA Special Education</p> <p>619 ECSE Team DOE Office of Communications FHF</p> <p>619 ECSE Team DHH/Early Steps OCDD</p> <p>619 ECSE Team DHH/Early Steps Stakeholder Group</p>
<p>Activity 12.2 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Timelines</p>	<p>Resources</p>
<p>Continue all monthly monitoring begun in 2005-2006.</p> <p>Continue with non-compliance follow-up phone calls and letters to LEAs.</p> <p>Provide targeted TA to LEAs found noncompliant after first out-of-date IEP.</p> <p>Meet with stakeholders to review compliance with IDEA regulations; develop strategies to address non-compliant</p>	<p>Monthly, 2006-07</p> <p>Monthly, 2006-07</p> <p>Monthly, 2006-07</p> <p>Fall 2006</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators</p> <p>619 ECSE Team ECSE Regional Coordinators</p>

issues.		DHH/Early Steps OCDD 619 ECSE Team ECSE transition stakeholder group
Activity 12.3 (2007-2011)	Timelines	Resources
Continue all activities listed in 2005-06 and 2006-07, with continuous evaluation of non-compliance and follow-up TA.	2008-2011	As listed above and Part C Settings Community of Practice National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center Technical Assistance Alliance for Part Center, National Technical Assistance Center.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator area.

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

Louisiana will be collecting data on this new monitoring indicator area for the first time through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) during the 2005-06 school year. (See Indicator 15 for a complete description of the Louisiana CIMP Process. Also, see Indicator 2: Improvement Activity 2.3). IEPs of students 16 years old and older will be reviewed, noting the number of students whose IEPs include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable them to meet their post-secondary goals. Monitoring will indicate the percentage of compliance for those monitored LEAs.

Monitoring activities will continue to be used to collect data on the performance of districts on this area.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator area.

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

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

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

Discussion of Baseline Data: Status data will be reported in the February 2007 Annual Performance Report, and baseline data will be reported in the February 2008 *Annual Performance Report*.

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

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent of non-compliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of non-compliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any non-compliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the state has taken.

B. Percent of non-compliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of non-compliance made related to such areas.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any non-compliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the state has taken.

C. Percent of non-compliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of agencies in which non-compliance was identified through other mechanisms.
- b. # of findings of non-compliance made.
- c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = c divided by b times 100.

For any non-compliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the state has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

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

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

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

The LEA self-review component is also included as part of the system of document review, examination, and analysis. Every year, each LEA is required to conduct a self-review assessment to determine areas of non-compliance, weakness or strength. Using the information obtained in the self-review, the LEA is able to target those areas where improvement activities are needed. The self-review summary information is a part of the application process, and thereby allows LDE personnel to review LEA self-review findings as part of the application process to assure that noncompliant areas are targeted in the application. A component of the document review process that needs additional follow-up training is the district improvement plan review. Ideally, the special education findings from the self-review and any on-site monitoring citations should be addressed in the district improvement plans. This is an area of the document review process where we feel we must increase our coordination efforts.

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

Another activity received well by the LEAs is a series of quarterly informational meetings for the local education agencies' directors of special education. At these meetings, LEAs are provided with information and explanations of regulatory requirements, and the policies, procedures and practices necessary for compliance. Monthly meetings with an ad hoc committee assure that current information is disseminated more frequently. Special education issues and concerns are also addressed monthly with local education agency superintendents at Parish Superintendent Advisory Committee meetings. These meetings also offer opportunities for the state to explain its general supervisory functions and the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP).

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

To ensure a fair comparison among LEAs, Louisiana has stratified its 68 local education agencies into four population groups based upon the number of students served. Within these four groups, districts are ranked according to how well they compare to the state average for each indicator that stakeholders have selected for focus; then, LEAs are ranked according to their deviation from the state average within their population group. In this way, two to three focus indicators have been used

across the four groups to annually select 8-12 districts for focused, on-site monitoring visits. During on-site monitoring which follows the selection of districts, a trained, state-sponsored monitoring team investigates LEA policies, procedures and practices, as well as any record of complaints, to uncover non-compliance impacting poor student outcomes in the area of focus.

From among those LEAs not selected for focused monitoring, LDE also selects districts for random, on-site monitoring visits. In these LEAs, all of the focus indicator areas, as well as information on complaints, are reviewed.

Non-compliance discovered during on-site monitoring is addressed by the LEA through a corrective action plan (CAP). A district must outline steps it will take to correct deficiencies and describe the timeline, personnel responsible and the evidence of compliance which it proposes. The LEA is required to collaborate with the LDE in developing the corrective action plan and must submit its CAP within thirty-five business days of receipt of the on-site summary of findings report. Upon receipt of findings, the LEA must immediately begin correcting non-compliance and complete all activities in the CAP within one year. The Division of Special Populations documents that all activities have been completed within stipulated timelines or provides written permission for extensions in cases of real hardship such as the loss of documents during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in August /September 2005.

Creating an effective corrective action plan is critical to the LEA effort. LDE has provided assistance with this task by offering training and technical assistance in the construction of effective CAPs which foster the change needed to impact student outcomes. Regional special education coordinators, LDE staff and the monitoring team leaders have assisted districts in writing CAPs.

The follow-up, on-site visit is employed when LDE requires further verification of compliance at the completion of the CAP timeline. A monitoring team returns to a district and determines if there is continuing evidence of non-compliance in the areas where citations were issued. Further corrective actions on an accelerated timeline are required of districts with continuing evidence of non-compliance, and additional on-site visits by LDE may occur. In districts having significant difficulties achieving compliance through state technical assistance and training, the LDE has required that IDEA funds be used to employ state-approved, outside consultants to assist in this task. Another sanction is the withholding of IDEA funds

LEAs not selected for focused or random monitoring are designated as being in *Continuous Improvement* and usually do not receive on-site compliance visits during the year. When critical issues of non-compliance are identified by means other than the performance profiles (including, but not limited to complaint logs, evaluation extension requests, and financial risk assessments), targeted, on-site compliance monitoring visits may be required by the Louisiana Department of Education. Proactive measures of self-evaluation, support, and technical assistance are part of the monitoring process to ensure compliance with all regulatory requirements at the federal and state levels. Findings from data analysis, as well as findings from on-site compliance visits, are used in allocating various LDE resources for technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Measurement A: The percent of non-compliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year from identification is 84%.

Measurement B: The percent of non-compliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year from identification is 79%.

Measurement C: Percent of non-compliance identified through other mechanisms (e.g., complaints, due process hearings, mediations) corrected within one year of identification is 98%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

The actual number of non-compliant findings related to monitoring priority areas was 79. The number of findings corrected within one year of the district's receiving the finding reports was 62, for a total of 84% compliance within a one-year timeframe.

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

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

In Measurements A and B, non-compliance which was not corrected within one year was the result of departmental policy, procedure, and practice regarding the CAP writing process. It was felt that serious, systemic non-compliance often required an extended CAP that would include continuing LDE oversight sometimes for as long as three years. In cases where focused monitoring pointed to poor performance and poor data in selected districts, it was considered essential that data improve in order to demonstrate that substantial change had occurred. In effect, LEAs felt they had the latitude to take long-term corrective actions.

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

The delay in beginning corrective action has been eliminated through revised language in *Bulletin 1922*, effective November 2005, which now states that LEAs must begin to correct known non-compliance immediately upon receipt of the state's *Summary of Findings*. Letters accompanying the state's *Summary of Findings* issued after September 2005 further direct LEAs to correct violations within prescribed time limits, which are delineated and in no cases exceed a one-year timeframe. Districts are instructed to submit their corrective action plans to the state within 35 business days. These CAPs are evaluated and revised by the state when necessary to maintain appropriate timelines and to ensure that activities address all non-compliant findings.

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

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

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

The remaining 18 findings of non-compliance were in the following areas:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity 15.1	Timelines	Resources
Improve self-assessment tools/documents/processes used by LEAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise LEA self-assessment tools and documents to reflect SPP Monitoring Priority Areas. • Collect baseline data on LEA self-assessment findings and corrections. • Evaluate self-assessment tools developed in FY 2005 to determine if baseline data from LEA self-assessment accurately pinpoints areas of non-compliance when compared with known, LEA reported data. • Revise LEA self-assessment tools and documents, as needed. • Maintain database of LEA non-compliance and dates of correction. 	FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 Ongoing	IDEA 2004 Funds Contracted Employee
Improvement Activity 15.2	Timelines	Resources
LDE will revise <i>Bulletin 1922</i> , which outlines Louisiana’s monitoring procedures, to include appropriate guidelines for applying sanctions for non-compliance by LEAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise and approve <i>Bulletin 1922</i>. • Include standards for applying sanctions in state regulations, <i>Bulletin 1706</i>. • Correct all forms, templates, letters, and documents so that timely correction is emphasized. • Collect compliance data which includes LDE findings of non-compliance for Measurements A, B and C. • Approve CAPs addressing identified non-compliance based upon timely correction from date of notification of findings. • Maintain documentation of LEA corrective actions so as not to exceed one-year, time-limited correction, based upon the date of notification of findings. • Evaluate the effectiveness of the sanction process by comparing SPP baseline data from the Dec. 2, 2005 submission, with data collected under new procedures. • Investigate LEA non-compliance that exceeds one-year timelines to determine causes. • Revise procedures if necessary. 	FY 2005 FY 2005 FY 2005 FY 2005 FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2006 FY 2007 Ongoing	IDEA 2004 Funding LDE Staff National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring Regional Resource Centers Technical Assistance Alliance for Parent Centers- National Technical Assistance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 16.1	Timelines	Resources
Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) <i>State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance</i> in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.	FY 2005	IDEA 2004 Funding LDE Staff
Assign support staff for the logging, calendaring and filing of complaints. Establish backup for complaint investigators.	FY 2005	CADRE
Establish a system of quarterly reviews to track any timeline failures.	FY 2005	Regional Resource Centers
Establish mechanism for evaluating the timeliness of the dispute resolution system.	FY 2006	

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement:

Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Requests for due process hearings are processed by LDE staff attorneys and assigned to contract mediators, and/or hearing officers. All hearing requests are assigned to a hearing officer for further action (most are resolved and do not result in a hearing and written decision).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The state received 70 requests for due process hearings between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Of these, 55 were resolved by mediation or were withdrawn or dismissed. A total of 15 cases were fully adjudicated, 7 within 45 days of receipt of the hearing and 7 within duly granted extensions. Only one of the 15 was reported late, and then by only one day. Fifty percent had one or more extensions. Most extension requests were joint requests, made with the agreement of both parties. The department is in the process of surveying involved parties to determine whether to issue guidelines for hearing officers to consider when determining whether to grant extensions. These efforts are incomplete due to delays by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

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

2010 (2010-2011)	100%
----------------------------	-------------

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 17.1	Timelines	Resources
Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.	FY 2005	IDEA 2004 Funding LDE Staff
Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for Hearing Officers.	FY 2005	Hearing Officers
Continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including due process hearings.	FY 2005	CADRE
Complete survey of parties involved in hearings where extensions were granted in order to determine necessity for hearing officer guidelines.	FY 2006	Regional Resource Centers
(See also Indicator 16, Improvement Activity 16.1)		

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator area.

Requests for due process hearings are processed by LDE staff attorneys and assigned to contract mediators and hearing officers. All hearing requests are assigned to a hearing officer for further action (most are resolved and do not result in a hearing and written decision).

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 *Annual Performance Report*.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

Louisiana’s goal is to establish an optimum percentage rate for this goal by participation in the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Education (CADRE) *State Needs Assessment*. Meanwhile, the goal is to increase resolution to 89% of all matters mediated either through the mediation or resolution session procedures or other alternative dispute resolution processes, without the costs and time delays attendant to the adjudication process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	88.2%
2006 (2006-2007)	88.3%
2007 (2007-2008)	88.4%

2008 (2008-2009)	88.5%
2009 (2009-2010)	88.6%
2010 (2010-2011)	89%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities 19.1	Timelines	Resources
Participate in the CADRE (Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education) <i>State Needs Assessment for Technical Assistance</i> in order to support broader state efforts over the next five years to improve dispute resolution practices and results.	FY 2005	IDEA 2004 Funding
Annual and ongoing education, guidance and training for mediators.	FY 2005	LDE Staff Mediators
Continue to assess system management and practices of all the various dispute resolution processes, including due process hearings, state complaint systems, mediations, and resolution sessions and their interrelationship.	FY 2005 FY 2006	CADRE Regional Resource Centers
Develop a system of IEP Facilitation to reduce the number of disputes in LEAs.	FY 2007	

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

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

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>State-reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for <i>Annual Performance Report</i>). b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

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

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

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

Assessment data also are edited and processed to ensure accuracy. For example, sample scanning and test data files for three districts and several special schools are delivered to LDE for review and approval before the contractor finalizes the state file. The predetermined file layout is included in the delivery. These files are examined to make sure they meet the LDE processing and scoring requirements. If the reports and/or the file do not meet LDE requirements, corrections are made and samples sent to LDE for further review and approval. Sample reports generated from the file are presented to LDE for review. These reports are used to examine the scoring accuracy, processing logs, and reporting formats. No reports are sent to the users without LDE sign-off.

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

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

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

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

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

<p>7) Four LDE Data Management staff provides help desk assistance to LEAs daily.</p> <p>8) LDE's Data Management staff maintains a webpage for the SER system that contains the <i>System User Guide</i>, a calendar, a list of dates to remember, PowerPoint presentations, and the security form. The website and <i>System User Guide</i> are updated on as-needed basis. As the system is modified the <i>User Guide</i> and website are updated.</p>		
--	--	--

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

Attachment #1

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	46
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	28
(a) Reports with findings	14
(b) Reports within timeline	10
(c) Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	14
(1.3) Complaints pending	4
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	2

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	31
(2.1) Mediations	25
(a) Mediations related to due process	17
(i) Mediation agreements	16
(b) Mediations not related to due process	8
(i) Mediation agreements	6
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	6

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	70
(3.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	15
(a) Decisions within timeline	7
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	7
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	55

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	9
(4.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	5
(a) Change of placement ordered	1

Source: Data from 2004-2005 Complaints and Due Process Hearings Log

