

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 30.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 34.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 40.67%.</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).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 11.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 18.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 50%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 64.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.4% for reading and 99.3% for math. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.7% for reading and 99.7% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 98.75% for reading and 98.8%</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for math. The State provided Web links to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results. The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the <u>school</u> level. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p>	<p>assessments at the district and school levels with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this Response Table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 35.4% for reading and 37.0% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 35.2% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 38.4% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 65.2% for reading and 68.4% for math.</p> <p>The State provided Web links to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the <u>school</u> level. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p>	<p>APR.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this Response Table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).
<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 FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 18.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 16.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 13.9%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 21 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
<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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 19 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of</p>	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
<p>discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p>																					
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 708 1583 1182"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">60.8</td> <td align="center">61.1</td> <td align="center">67.61</td> <td align="center">0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">14.1</td> <td align="center">13.7</td> <td align="center">9.76</td> <td align="center">0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.4</td> <td align="center">1.3</td> <td align="center">2.08</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.8	61.1	67.61	0.30%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.1	13.7	9.76	0.40%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.4	1.3	2.08	0.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.8	61.1	67.61	0.30%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.1	13.7	9.76	0.40%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.4	1.3	2.08	0.10%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program;</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																																
and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.  [Results Indicator; New]																																		
7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:  A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.  [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are:  <table border="1" data-bbox="548 521 1583 1500"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 521 959 623"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 521 1163 623"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 521 1373 623"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 521 1583 623"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 623 959 760"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 623 1163 760">63.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 623 1373 760">69.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 623 1583 760">63.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 760 959 927"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 760 1163 927">63.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 760 1373 927">70.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 760 1583 927">63.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 927 959 1029"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 927 1163 1029">70.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 927 1373 1029">74.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 927 1583 1029">70.5</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1029 959 1131"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 1029 1163 1131"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1029 1373 1131"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1029 1583 1131"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1131 959 1268"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1131 1163 1268">67.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1131 1373 1268">64.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1131 1583 1268">67.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1268 959 1435"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1268 1163 1435">57.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1268 1373 1435">56.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1268 1583 1435">57.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1435 959 1500"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1435 1163 1500">74.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1435 1373 1500">69.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1435 1583 1500">74.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	63.4	69.6	63.0	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	63.0	70.9	63.0	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	70.6	74.7	70.5	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	67.5	64.9	67.5	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	57.8	56.2	57.5	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	74.3	69.0	74.0	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.  The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	63.4	69.6	63.0																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	63.0	70.9	63.0																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	70.6	74.7	70.5																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	67.5	64.9	67.5																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	57.8	56.2	57.5																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	74.3	69.0	74.0																															

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="550 261 1583 293"> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 261 957 293">meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 261 1163 293"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 261 1373 293"></td> <td data-bbox="1373 261 1583 293"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="550 315 1583 380">These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>	meet their needs (%)				
meet their needs (%)						
<p data-bbox="92 415 522 610">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 data-bbox="92 631 312 664">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="550 415 1583 513">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 32%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 39%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 47%.</p> <p data-bbox="550 534 1583 599">In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 415 1992 545">OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 699 522 894">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 data-bbox="92 915 369 948">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="550 699 1583 764">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="550 786 1583 850">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="550 872 1583 1034">The State reported that two 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 data-bbox="550 1055 1373 1088">The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p data-bbox="550 1109 1583 1174">The State reported that two of 114 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities enrolled.</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 699 1992 764">OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 1200 522 1362">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 data-bbox="92 1383 369 1416">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="550 1200 1583 1297">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.51%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p data-bbox="550 1318 1583 1383">The State reported that four of 114 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities enrolled.</p> <p data-bbox="550 1404 1583 1469">The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 1200 1992 1265">OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 1500 522 1533">11. Percent of children who were</p>	<p data-bbox="550 1500 1583 1533">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 1500 1992 1533">OSEP appreciates the State’s</p>				

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.55%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.09%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 11 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96.45%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 21 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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,</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 53%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance in all nine districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance in the one district with a finding of noncompliance identified in FFY2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b)</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
<p>of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>(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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1109 1583 1513"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">25.3</td> <td align="center">23.39</td> <td align="center">25.5</td> <td align="center">-1.91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">55.3</td> <td align="center">67.97</td> <td align="center">55.5</td> <td align="center">12.67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary</td> <td align="center">73.6</td> <td align="center">83.53</td> <td align="center">73.8</td> <td align="center">11.93%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	25.3	23.39	25.5	-1.91%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	55.3	67.97	55.5	12.67%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	73.6	83.53	73.8	11.93%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	25.3	23.39	25.5	-1.91%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	55.3	67.97	55.5	12.67%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	73.6	83.53	73.8	11.93%																		

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 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>education or training program; or competitively employed</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 FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 67 of 69 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that two of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure the timely correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2009 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>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008 and FFY 2007. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining one finding</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) are 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) have corrected each</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>§300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 67%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that none of the three mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. 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>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.83%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure</p>

**Louisiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.