

**Table A – LOUISIANA Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State did not use the required measurement in reporting its data. On pages 56-57 of the SPP, the State reported that 31.62% of children referred to Part B had eligibility determined by their third birthdays, and that 68.38% of children referred to Part B had IEPs developed and implemented after their third birthdays. However, the State did not specify which of those children had previously received Part C services. In addition, the State did not include data in the SPP regarding the number of children referred from Part C to Part B who were determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility determinations were made prior to their third birthdays.</p>	<p>The State must include all required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: On pages 64-65 of the SPP, the State indicated that, for 2004-2005, 84% of identified noncompliance related to monitoring priority indicators was corrected within one year, and that 79% of identified noncompliance related to other areas was corrected within one year. In the discussion of baseline data on page 65, the State provided the reason for the delay in completing corrective actions, and described the changes in State procedures to ensure correction of district-level noncompliance within one year.</p>	<p>The State reported 84% and 79% levels of compliance for Indicators 15A and 15B in the SPP, respectively, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.600. The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: On page 69 of the SPP and in Attachment 1, the State reported a 37% level of compliance for Indicator 16 in the SPP, specifically the timeline requirement at 34 CFR §300.661. The State further indicated that the delays were due to personnel issues that have been resolved.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected, and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>