

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 17.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 13.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 18%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 28.97%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 22.99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 54.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 74.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 70%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.35% for English language arts (ELA) and 99.31% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.19% for ELA and 99.16% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 98.71% for ELA and 98.68% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
standards. [Results Indicator]																																																																	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 399 1419 849"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>37.56 %</td> <td>39.13 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>40.09%</td> <td>43.0 %</td> <td>41.8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>30.89 %</td> <td>33.84 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>34.80%</td> <td>34.43%</td> <td>41.8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>30.49 %</td> <td>26.70 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>37.41%</td> <td>31.65%</td> <td>41.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>29.71 %</td> <td>28.07 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>30.49%</td> <td>29.93%</td> <td>41.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>24.67 %</td> <td>23.34 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>26.64%</td> <td>26.73%</td> <td>41.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>15.51 %</td> <td>19.66 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>18.84%</td> <td>21.74%</td> <td>41.8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>30.06 %</td> <td>27.85 %</td> <td>47.4 %</td> <td>32.54%</td> <td>31.31%</td> <td>41.8 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the State's FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 target for grade 3 math, but did not meet its other targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	37.56 %	39.13 %	47.4 %	40.09%	43.0 %	41.8 %	4	30.89 %	33.84 %	47.4 %	34.80%	34.43%	41.8 %	5	30.49 %	26.70 %	47.4 %	37.41%	31.65%	41.8%	6	29.71 %	28.07 %	47.4 %	30.49%	29.93%	41.8%	7	24.67 %	23.34 %	47.4 %	26.64%	26.73%	41.8%	8	15.51 %	19.66 %	47.4 %	18.84%	21.74%	41.8 %	HS	30.06 %	27.85 %	47.4 %	32.54%	31.31%	41.8 %	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	37.56 %	39.13 %	47.4 %	40.09%	43.0 %	41.8 %																																																											
4	30.89 %	33.84 %	47.4 %	34.80%	34.43%	41.8 %																																																											
5	30.49 %	26.70 %	47.4 %	37.41%	31.65%	41.8%																																																											
6	29.71 %	28.07 %	47.4 %	30.49%	29.93%	41.8%																																																											
7	24.67 %	23.34 %	47.4 %	26.64%	26.73%	41.8%																																																											
8	15.51 %	19.66 %	47.4 %	18.84%	21.74%	41.8 %																																																											
HS	30.06 %	27.85 %	47.4 %	32.54%	31.31%	41.8 %																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 29.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 26.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 21.5%.</p> <p>The State did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its 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 2004 or 2005.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005 response table related to ensuring that all LEAs identified with significant discrepancies being required to review, and if appropriate, revise their</p>	<p>The State did not, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, include in the February 1, 2008 APR, a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 Part B of the IDEA for all LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2004, FFY 2005, and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). This constitutes</p>																																																															

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>policies, procedures, and practices, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), each year.</p>	<p>noncompliance under this regulation.</p> <p>Further, the State did not, as also required by OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, clarify the improvement activity of reviewing at least 25% of LEAs per year, to ensure that all LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to review, and if appropriate, revise their policies, procedures, and practices, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) each year.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, and must clarify that the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices is conducted on an annual basis for all districts identified for that year with significant discrepancies.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>																		
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1419 1114"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>57.6%</td> <td>57.99%</td> <td>57.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>15.71%</td> <td>16.11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>1.86%</td> <td>2.19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.6%	57.99%	57.76%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.7%	15.71%	16.11%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.9%	1.86%	2.19%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.6%	57.99%	57.76%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.7%	15.71%	16.11%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.9%	1.86%	2.19%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
special education settings). [Results Indicator]																										
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 431 1419 1115"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 431 1062 605">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 431 1182 605">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 431 1302 605">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 431 1419 605">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 605 1062 675">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 605 1182 675">4.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 605 1302 675">2.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 605 1419 675">2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 675 1062 810">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 675 1182 810">19.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 675 1302 810">14.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 675 1419 810">11.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 810 1062 911">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 810 1182 911">1.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 810 1302 911">1.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 810 1419 911">1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 911 1062 1011">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 911 1182 1011">6.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 911 1302 1011">6.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 911 1419 1011">5.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1011 1062 1115">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1011 1182 1115">68.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1011 1302 1115">74.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1011 1419 1115">79.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.4%	2.7%	2.3%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	19.1%	14.7%	11.3%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6.5%	6.4%	5.9%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	68.8%	74.7%	79.0%	OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data and improvement activities. The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.4%	2.7%	2.3%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	19.1%	14.7%	11.3%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6.5%	6.4%	5.9%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	68.8%	74.7%	79.0%																							
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.	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 39%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 39%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																								

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 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 in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State’s data are not valid and reliable, because the State:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did not examine data for the underrepresentation of races and ethnicities in special education and related services (the State reported that it had not directly examined underrepresentation, but would do so in subsequent APRs); and 2. Reviewed data only for initial evaluations, rather than for all students in special education and related services. <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or slippage or met its targets.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to: (1) provide baseline data from FFY 2005 and progress data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification; and (2) describe how the State made those determinations. The State provided data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 and described how it identified disproportionate representation. However, the State’s explanation makes it clear that the State is not reviewing data to determine underrepresentation, and is basing its determination of overrepresentation only on information about initial evaluations, rather than all identification. Thus, the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), and did not submit valid and reliable data.</p> <p>The State has chosen to use “significant” disproportionate representation in the description of its risk ratios. It is unclear whether the State intended to define disproportionate representation as <u>significant</u> disproportionality. If so, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State also must describe how it is complying with requirements in 34 CFR §300.646 for districts identified with disproportionate representation under Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data,</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		including data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 on both underrepresentation and on all students in special education and related services (not just students identified in initial evaluations) in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP as shown with Indicator 9 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>These data are not valid and reliable because the State did not examine data for the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or slippage or met its targets.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table regarding inappropriate identification for FFY 2005.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to: (1) provide baseline data from FFY 2005 and progress data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and (2) describe how the State made those determinations. The State provided data for FFY 2005 and FFFY 2006 but did not describe how it made those determinations. The State must provide this information in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>As required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), the State must submit valid and reliable data (including data on underrepresentation and for all children with disabilities identified in the six specific disability categories in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. OSEP recalculated the data to be 97%. The State provided additional data showing that there were valid explanations as to why initial evaluations were not completed for 574 children (e.g., the child died or moved from Louisiana, or the parent rescinded consent for the evaluation). Removing those children from the calculation would raise the percentage for this indicator to 100%.</p> <p>These data remained the same from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data that reflected the required measurements for this indicator, on percent and number of children with parental consent to evaluate whose evaluations were completed within the State established timeline. The State also was directed to</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	<p>provide the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluations were completed and any reasons for delay and the State provided these data. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.8%.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 64.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>In Indicator 15, the State reported that 34 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in CFR §300.124, including data on correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and data on correction of remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2003 and FFY 2004. Regarding the noncompliance identified in FFY 2003 and 2004, the State reported that all but two LEAs were in 100% compliance for one full quarter for this indicator in FFY 2006. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the remaining noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124 (b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 31%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>In Indicator 15, the State reported that 14 of 16 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the LEAs will collaborate with the State on a course of action to correct the noncompliance and correction of student-specific citations through Corrective Action Plans.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State was to include the actual number of youth with IEPs that included annual IEP goals and transition services, to correspond to the reported percentage. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 38.82%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 122 of 132 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it incorporates Corrective Action Plans that are specifically designed to meet the unique compliance needs of the districts, on-site follow-up visits where there is continuing noncompliance, and a three-year improvement effort to make needed changes in a system to address discipline.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 and prior years.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on six complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that six of eight resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 73.9%. OSEP recalculated the percentage for this indicator to be 75%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that seven of nine mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77%. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601 (b).</p>