

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 86%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that four of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the three uncorrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance, the State reported that it developed corrective action plans and provided training and targeted technical assistance to affected programs.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, documentation that it corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The State reported the subsequent correction of seven of the nine findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 relating to the timely service provision requirements in Part C. For the two remaining FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance, the State conducted more frequent chart reviews and provided technical assistance to agencies.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 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 reported that noncompliance identified in FFYs 2005 and 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) were partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining two FFY 2005 and three FFY 2006 findings were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of its findings from FFYs 2005 and 2006, and any noncompliance reported under this indicator in FFY 2007, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</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 reported data for this indicator are 99%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 98%.</p>	<p>The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments are at or greater than 95%. There is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and assumes that the State is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance with 34 CFR §§303.12, 303.18, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii).</p>																								
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="531 732 1428 1451"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="531 732 1058 915">07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1058 732 1182 915">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 732 1306 915">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1306 732 1428 915">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 915 1058 987">a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1058 915 1182 987">53</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 915 1306 987">50</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1306 915 1428 987">49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 987 1058 1130">b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1058 987 1182 1130">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 987 1306 1130">0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1306 987 1428 1130">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1130 1058 1235">c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1058 1130 1182 1235">17</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1130 1306 1235">14</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1306 1130 1428 1235">19</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1235 1058 1341">d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1058 1235 1182 1341">4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1235 1306 1341">4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1306 1235 1428 1341">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1341 1058 1451">e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1058 1341 1182 1451">25</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1341 1306 1451">32</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1306 1341 1428 1451">26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	53	50	49	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1	0	0	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	17	14	19	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	4	4	4	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25	32	26	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	53	50	49																							
b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1	0	0																							
c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	17	14	19																							
d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	4	4	4																							
e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25	32	26																							

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	Total (approx. 100%)		100.00 %	100.00 %	98.00%																					
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="531 472 1451 862"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="531 472 997 621"></th> <th data-bbox="997 472 1115 621">FFY 2006 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1115 472 1232 621">FFY 2007 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1232 472 1350 621">FFY 2007 Target</th> <th data-bbox="1350 472 1451 621">Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 621 997 675">A. Know their rights. (%)</td> <td data-bbox="997 621 1115 675">78</td> <td data-bbox="1115 621 1232 675">64</td> <td data-bbox="1232 621 1350 675">75</td> <td data-bbox="1350 621 1451 675">-14.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 675 997 773">B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)</td> <td data-bbox="997 675 1115 773">84</td> <td data-bbox="1115 675 1232 773">80</td> <td data-bbox="1232 675 1350 773">73</td> <td data-bbox="1350 675 1451 773">-4.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 773 997 862">C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td> <td data-bbox="997 773 1115 862">81</td> <td data-bbox="1115 773 1232 862">85</td> <td data-bbox="1232 773 1350 862">87</td> <td data-bbox="1350 773 1451 862">4.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>These data represent progress for 4C and slippage for 4A and 4B from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 4B and did not meet its targets for 4A and 4C.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2007 data, the State reported that while it was confident that the statewide response group was representative of the State's population, it was less confident regarding the representativeness of the response group at the regional level and included an improvement activity to address this issue.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit a sampling plan for OSEP approval if it collected data for this indicator by using a sampling methodology. The State reported that it collected census data for this indicator in FFY 2006 and that it used both census and sampling to collect data for this indicator in FFY 2007.</p>						FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights. (%)	78	64	75	-14.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	84	80	73	-4.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	81	85	87	4.00%	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported to OSEP that it used both census and sampling to collect data for this indicator and that it would submit its sampling plan to OSEP by June 1, 2009. It is important that the State have an approved sampling plan to ensure that the data it reports under this indicator are valid and reliable. If the State intends to collect data for this indicator through sampling, it must submit its sampling methodology for this indicator as soon as possible in order to ensure that OSEP will be able to determine if its FFY 2008 data are valid and reliable.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																						
A. Know their rights. (%)	78	64	75	-14.00%																						
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	84	80	73	-4.00%																						
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	81	85	87	4.00%																						

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</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 reported data for this indicator are 1.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of .85%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.30%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</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 reported data for this indicator are 1.78%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.27%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 2.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 14 of 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the three uncorrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance, the State reported that it required monthly self assessments from the affected SPOEs, provided targeted technical assistance, and included individual program performance review as part of the contract renewal process for the SPOEs.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, documentation that it corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a). The State reported the subsequent correction of five of the seven uncorrected findings of noncompliance. For the two remaining findings, the State reported that it increased the frequency of data reviews, developed corrective action plans,</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFYs 2005 and 2006 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) were partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining two FFY 2005 and three FFY 2006 findings were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of its findings from</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>and provided targeted technical assistance to agencies.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 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>FFYs 2005 and 2006, and any noncompliance reported under this indicator in FFY 2007, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the three uncorrected findings, the State reported that it provided technical assistance and plans to conduct additional monitoring activities for those agencies.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining three FFY 2006 findings were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, the actual numbers used in the calculation for Indicator 8B, and a copy of the relevant portions of its interagency agreement with the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) and the policies or procedures that it uses to ensure that its provision to LDE of a list of names of children in Part C who will shortly reach age three results in the required timely notification to the LEA for the area in which each eligible Part C child resides. The State provided information regarding the actual numbers used in the calculation for this indicator and the relevant portions of its interagency agreement with LDE regarding LEA notification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) was partially</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the three uncorrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance, the State reported that it developed corrective action plans, required monthly follow-up with SPOEs, and provided training to providers and agency staff.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to document in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that it corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). The State reported the subsequent correction of the three uncorrected FFY 2005 findings.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 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>corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining three FFY 2006 noncompliance findings were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of the three remaining FFY 2006 findings and noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 72%. These data</p>	<p>The State reported that six FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance (two under Indicator 1, two under Indicator 7, and the other two in non-priority areas), remain uncorrected. The</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 81.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 31 of 43 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the 12 uncorrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance, the State reported that it used program- and provider-specific enforcement actions to address the remaining noncompliance, which included technical assistance and monthly chart reviews. Sanctions were imposed with some SPOEs and providers, which included recoupment of funds, disenrollment of providers, agency closure, and nonfunding of a SPOE contract.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to document, in the FFY 2007 APR, that it corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State reported the subsequent correction of 17 of the 23 FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance. For the uncorrected six FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance (two under Indicator 1, two under Indicator 7 and the other two in non-priority areas), the State reported in Indicator 9 (in addition to the information provided under Indicators 1 and 7) that it increased the frequency of data reviews, developed corrective action plans, and provided targeted technical assistance to agencies.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 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>State's failure to correct this longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision systems. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of the remaining FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators, the outstanding FFY 2005 findings under Indicators 1 and 7, and the outstanding FFY 2006 findings under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and</p>

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		8C. In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.
10. 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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on six complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §§303.510 through 303.512.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the FFY 2007 reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). [Results Indicator]	Not applicable.	This indicator does not apply to the State because the State has not adopted the Part B due process procedures to resolve Part C due process hearing requests.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that no mediations were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

Louisiana Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. 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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 93.1%. The FFY 2006 data were 93.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>