

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 35.3%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 25%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP. The State explained the difference.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12.2%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 21%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 72.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 56.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 75.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.3% for reading and 99.2% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 98.7%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://www.louisianaschools.net/LDE/uploads/5244.pdf</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 33.5% for reading and 36.5% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 53.5% for reading and 57.9% in math.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/uploads/13559.pdf for LEAP (general assessment for students in grades 4 and 8). http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/uploads/11881.pdf for iLEAP (general assessment for students in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 revised reported data for this indicator are 33.33%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 19.0% or less.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator; New]																						
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 516 1467 984"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>60.39</td> <td>61.3</td> <td>62.69</td> <td>0.91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>14.85</td> <td>14.3</td> <td>12.94</td> <td>0.55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>2.14</td> <td>0.24%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B.		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.39	61.3	62.69	0.91%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.85	14.3	12.94	0.55%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.74	1.5	2.14	0.24%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.39	61.3	62.69	0.91%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.85	14.3	12.94	0.55%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.74	1.5	2.14	0.24%																		
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.	The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.																				

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
[Results Indicator; New]														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and revised improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1444 1125"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 597 919 711">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 597 1192 711"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 597 1444 711"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 711 919 849">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 711 1192 849">24</td> <td data-bbox="1192 711 1444 849">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 849 919 1019">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 849 1192 1019">37</td> <td data-bbox="1192 849 1444 1019">82</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 919 1125">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1019 1192 1125">41</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1019 1444 1125">83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	24	75	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	37	82	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	41	83	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	24	75												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	37	82												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	41	83												
<p>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.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 36%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 31%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 43%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>												

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

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

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it is making determinations about whether LEAs have disproportionate representation based on the analysis of child count data for all children in special education rather than an analysis of data on children who received initial evaluations. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are .94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 55 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories</p> <p>OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it is making determinations about whether LEAs have disproportionate representation based on the analysis of child count data for all children in special education</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>rather than an analysis of data on children who received initial evaluations. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 99.86%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	<p>correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 81.15%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 95.41%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%. The State explained in the narrative under Indicator 12 in its FFY 2008 APR when accounting for children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e that some of the reasons for delay were data entry errors, LEA processing problems, staff issues, parent failure to keep appointments, student medical needs, etc. OSEP cannot determine if any of</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>these children fit within the exceptions in 34 CFR §300.301(d). The State can recalculate the measurement for 12d and include in 12d any children whose parents repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for a Part B evaluation or whose parents enrolled their child in a new LEA after the child was referred to Part B but before the child’s third birthday (i.e., before the previous LEA has conducted the evaluation, determined eligibility for Part B services, and if appropriate, developed and implemented an IEP), as well as children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused a delay in evaluation or initial services. See 34 CFR §300.301(d).</p> <p>OSEP noted in its March 5, 2010 verification letter that the measurement the State had been using for Indicator 12 was not consistent with the measurement required by OSEP’s Indicator Measurement Table, and that the State’s data for this indicator were not, therefore, valid and reliable. Specifically, the State had acknowledged that, in its calculation of the State’s compliance level for Indicator 12, the State had considered only whether the LEA had <u>developed</u> an IEP by the third birthday, and not also whether the LEA had also <u>implemented</u> the IEP by the child’s third birthday. In its FFY 2008 APR, submitted on February 1, 2010, the State informed OSEP of steps that it had taken since the October 2009 verification visit to enable the State to report valid and reliable FFY 2008 data for Indicator 12. OSEP concludes that no further documentation is required to demonstrate correction of the finding in the verification letter.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 20 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining two findings subsequently were corrected by February 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that the two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in 2005 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that three of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by September 2009. However, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining five uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>CFR §300.320(b), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>Although the State had reported in its FFY 2007 APR that all seven FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance were timely corrected, in the FFY 2008 APR, the State reported that six of eight FFY 2006 findings were timely corrected and that the remaining two were corrected in FFY 2008.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 30, 2009.</p>	<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%. The State reported that 51 of 60 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, and that five findings subsequently were corrected by April 2010. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Further, although the State reported that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, OSEP's March 5, 2010 verification visit letter found that the State's use of percentage thresholds below 100% for requiring correction of findings made through focused and random on-site reviews was inconsistent with sections 612(a)(11) and 616 of the IDEA, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and the guidance in OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP's letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of OSEP's letter, an assurance that it revised its procedures for determining timely correction of noncompliance, so that it determines that noncompliance has been corrected only when it has verified, for each district with noncompliance, that it both: (1) is correctly (i.e., 100%) implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. In its May 2, 2010 response, the State provided that assurance.</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 23 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and all ten of the remaining ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and the OSEP 09-02 memo was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the remaining finding identified in FFY 2006, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and each LEA with uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 30, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 5, 2010 verification visit letter found the State’s practice of not issuing findings of noncompliance identified through the self-review process and not requiring the correction of those findings was inconsistent with the Part B monitoring and correction requirements in sections 612(a)(11) and 616, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E). OSEP’s verification visit letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of OSEP’s letter, a written assurance that it revised its general supervision procedures so that if the State receives the results of a district’s self-review in which the district acknowledges noncompliance or includes data that show noncompliance, the State must either: (1) issue a finding of noncompliance based on those data; or (2) verify whether those data demonstrate noncompliance, and issue a finding if they do demonstrate noncompliance. In its May 2, 2010 response, the State provided that assurance.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 5, 2010 verification visit letter also found that the State’s practice of not making a finding of noncompliance in cases where districts exceeded the 15-day resolution meeting timeline represented noncompliance under the Part B regulations, 34 CFR §300.510(a)(1). OSEP’s verification visit letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of OSEP’s letter, a written assurance that it has revised its procedures to provide that the State will issue a finding of noncompliance when a district does not comply with the 15-day timeline for resolution meetings. In its May 2, 2010 response, the State provided that assurance.</p>	<p>review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
16. Percent of signed written	The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four complaints. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 30, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 5, 2010 verification visit letter required the State to provide a copy of the notification it uses to advise parties to complaints that implementation of the corrective actions in complaint decisions may not be delayed pending reconsideration requests. In its May 2, 2010 response, the State provided a copy of that notification.</p>	<p>achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 71%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 63%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 75%.</p>	<p>State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that two of four mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>