



STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
POST OFFICE BOX 94064, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9064
Toll Free #: 1-877-453-2721
<http://www.louisianaschools.net>

D.D. Council Quarterly Report
July 2011
Louisiana Department of Education (LDE)

1. Meets Requirements Status

The Director of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) notified Acting Superintendent of Education, Ollie Tyler, on June 20, 2011 that the Louisiana Department of Education obtained "Meet Requirements" status. The determination covers the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires states to develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) and report annually on compliance and performance indicators. Louisiana had been in "Needs Assistance" for four years. The determination is made by evaluating 20 compliance and performance indicators. The Louisiana Department of Education was able to show through valid and reliable data that it had a high correction of compliance issues. The Louisiana Department of Education must give each local education agency a determination of Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention. Included as an attachment to this report is a chart which provides a review of Louisiana's status across the 20 compliance and performance indicators. For further information on this topic, contact bernell.cook@la.gov

2. Certified Behavior Analyst

At the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) meeting in June, the board approved for final adoption a new ancillary certificate called Certified Behavior Analyst. This certification will allow school districts to hire persons who have certification issued by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BABC) or the Comprehensive Application of Behavior Analysis to Schooling Board (CABAS). These individuals could greatly assist districts with students who have challenging behaviors. LDE staff members wish to publicly thank Shawn Fleming for assistance in getting the information regarding the final adoption out to the public so that supporters would be present at the board meeting. For further information, contact nancy.hicks@la.gov

3. IDEA High Risk Pool

The LDE is pleased to release the IDEA High Risk Pool Request for Applications (RFA) to school districts and charter schools that serve students with disabilities in our state. In an effort to assist in funding special education services for high-needs students, the Department of Education will make available approximately \$1.8 million through IDEA legislation and the Louisiana IDEA State Plan. High Risk Pools are established to support local education agencies that provide special education services and/or related services that significantly exceed ordinary costs for providing a free appropriate public education and financially

"An Equal Opportunity Employer"

impact the budget of the local education agency providing the services. All school districts and charter schools who meet the eligibility criteria as identified in the Risk Pool application are encouraged to apply for assistance. A letter informing district superintendents, charter school directors, directors of state board schools, and directors of special education of the availability of funds has been mailed. Questions or concerns may be directed to Angela Randall at 225.342.0254 or at angela.randall@la.gov

4. New Rules Added to Bulletin 1530: Louisiana's IEP Handbook for Students with Exceptionalities

In February 2011, BESE approved for final adoption the revisions to Bulletin 1530: *Louisiana's IEP Handbook for Students with Exceptionalities*. The IEP Handbook's revisions to Chapter 1, §105 and §113 eliminate ambiguity and provide clarity pertaining to timelines and IEP amendments. The revisions in Chapter 5, §505 reflect the requirement to include End of Course (EOC) in the LAA 2 participation criteria. The addition of EOC to the LAA 2 Participation Criteria will be reflected on the LAA 2 Participation Criteria form after the May 4, 2011 release to SER. Revisions to Chapter 1 §117 reflect the new federal reporting guidelines for the preschool Placement/Least Restrictive Educational Environments. The changes to the Preschool LRE environments are presently reflected on the IEP. For further information about these changes, contact Noah Wartelle at noah.wartelle@la.gov

5. Louisiana Co-Teaching Resource Guide

The Louisiana Co-Teaching Resource Guide is currently available on the Access Guide website (Click [HERE](#); "Core Instruction Tab" – Collaboration and Co-Teaching). The Louisiana State Improvement Grant (LaSIG), in collaboration with the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE), brought together a team of strategists to develop the Louisiana Co-Teaching Resource Guide as an expansion to the efforts of the Louisiana Validated Practices Initiative. Members of the strategist group, which included teachers, curriculum coordinators, university faculty, special education directors, inclusion coordinators, families, and speech and language therapists, developed the guide based on best practices. This document is intended for the use of school and district level personnel as a guide for effective co-teaching and inclusive practices. The document is broken down into three sections: Planning, Implementation, and Results, with pertinent forms and resources included for each section. The materials included in each respective section may be modified to fit district and school needs. For further information about this guide, contact kristina.braud@la.gov

6. SALSA (Speech and Language Support for All)

The Louisiana Department of Education's SALSA initiative is working towards redefining and expanding the roles of Speech Language Pathologists within schools. The goals of SALSA are 1) to support students with deficits in literacy, numeracy, or behavior, 2) to maximize the efforts and expertise of the SLP, and, 3) to facilitate collaborative efforts between the SLP, other educators, and parents. The SALSA Speech-Language Pathologists (SLP) Cadre Leadership

Academy was held on June 8-10, 2011. For further information on this initiative, contact Phyllis Butler at phyllis.butler@la.gov

7. Literacy Data Summits

The Literacy Office has been working with the Cecil Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning to develop materials for data summits relative to the performance and placement of students with disabilities. Five of these summits will be held across the state beginning at the end of August 2011. School systems will be invited and will be asked to bring teams of both general and special educators. The purpose of the summits is to guide local education agencies in analyzing their student data (e.g., performance, placement) so that this information can be used to target improvement efforts and allocate resources appropriately. For further information, contact debra.dixon@la.gov

8. Surrogate Parent Trainings

Via funding through the LDE, Families Helping Families will conduct the following Surrogate Parent Trainings.

Regional Surrogate Parent Training of Trainers	Time	Dates 2011-12	Locations Facility Phone, ONLY call for Directions if lost.
Regions 7 and 8	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Thursday, September 1 Shreveport, LA	<i>David Raines Branch Library</i> <i>2855 Martin Luther King Drive</i> <i>Shreveport, LA 71107 Phone: 318-222-0824</i>
	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Friday, September 2 Monroe, LA	Families Helping Families of Northeast Louisiana 5200 Northeast Road Monroe, LA 71203 Phone: 318-361-0487
Regions 6 and 5	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Thursday, September 8 Pineville, LA	Families Helping Families at the Crossroads 2840 Military Hwy Pineville, LA 71360 Phone: 318-641-7373
	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Friday, September 9 Lake Charles, LA	Families Helping Families of Southwest Louisiana 2927 Hodges Street Lake Charles, LA 70601 Phone: 337-436-2570
Regions 4 and 2	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Thursday, September 15 Baton Rouge, LA	BREC Independence Park 7505 Independence Boulevard, Room 137 Baton Rouge, LA 70806 Phone: 225-928-7860
	9 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Friday, September 16 Lafayette, LA	Vermilion Conference Center 326 Gautier Road Lafayette, LA 70501 Phone: 337-521-7210

9. **Louisiana Safe and Supportive Schools Initiative (LSSSI)**

The goal of the Louisiana Safe and Supportive Schools Initiative grant is to measure and improve statewide conditions for learning, which includes school safety, student engagement in school, and the overall school environment. The LSSSI project is made up of a strong team of LDOE School Climate Coaches dedicated to improving the conditions for learning in the districts and schools included within the grant.

The high school students, faculty and staff, and parents of the grantee districts are being surveyed to obtain reliable measures for school safety, engagement and environment. The student, staff, and parent surveys were developed, piloted, and are currently being administered.

The coaches working in collaboration with the participating districts and their schools' Positive Approaches for Safe and Supportive School (PASSS) Teams began administering the LSSI Student, Staff, and Parent Surveys on April 18, 2011. LDOE has the potential to survey approximately 57,000 students, as well as staff and parents. The data collection ended for students and staff on May 27, 2011. The parent surveys ended June 3, 2011.

Climate surveys and incident data will be used to develop a formula for a school climate score. The LSSSI project staff, in collaboration with the IT Department, is currently working on developing a formula that will be used to generate a School Climate Score for all schools in the grantee districts. The formula and schools' scores will be posted on the LDOE website prior to the start of the 2011–2012 school year. Activities and interventions will be selected and implemented at schools identified in need of assistance to improve conditions for learning. School profile reports will also be developed for distribution. For further information, contact terri.byrd@la.gov

10. **State Personnel Development Grant application**

The Louisiana Department of Education is submitting a State Personnel Development Grant (SIG) application to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on or before July 1, 2011. If this proposal is funded, this will be the 3rd SIG grant awarded to the LDE. These funds have been used to support best practices in serving students with disabilities selected Louisiana schools and districts.

The purpose of the proposed project is to develop a system of professional development and support based on state, district, and school needs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities ages 6-21 across all disabilities and create sustainable, evidence-based practices. The proposal has four focus areas related to the use and effectiveness of (1) Data Based Decision-Making, (2) Inclusive Practices, (3) Family Engagement, and (4) Culturally Responsive Practices. For further information, contact robin.clark@la.gov.

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 34.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 35.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 25%.</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 appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 11.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 12.2%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 21%.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 64.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 72.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.7% for reading and math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.3% for reading and 99.2%</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 98.7%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 35.2% for reading and 38.4% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 33.5% for reading and 36.5% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 53.5% for reading and 57.9% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 16.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 33.33%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 16.5%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 24 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 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 its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that all districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and none were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1143 1583 1500"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>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">61.3</td> <td align="center">60.8</td> <td align="center">65.15</td> <td align="center">-0.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">14.3</td> <td align="center">14.1</td> <td align="center">11.35</td> <td align="center">0.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools,</td> <td align="center">1.5</td> <td align="center">1.4</td> <td align="center">2.11</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.3	60.8	65.15	-0.50%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.3	14.1	11.35	0.20%	C. % In separate schools,	1.5	1.4	2.11	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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.3	60.8	65.15	-0.50%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.3	14.1	11.35	0.20%																		
C. % In separate schools,	1.5	1.4	2.11	0.10%																		

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
	residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements																
<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; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>				<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for FFY 2009 and targets for FFY 2010, and provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised FFY 2010 targets. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1182 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="552 1182 1012 1279"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="1012 1182 1203 1279"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1182 1394 1279"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1394 1182 1583 1279"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1279 1012 1385">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="1012 1279 1203 1385">24</td> <td data-bbox="1203 1279 1394 1385">63.42</td> <td data-bbox="1394 1279 1583 1385">32</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1385 1012 1521">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="1012 1385 1203 1521">37</td> <td data-bbox="1203 1385 1394 1521">63.01</td> <td data-bbox="1394 1385 1583 1521">35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	24	63.42	32	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	37	63.01	35	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>														
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	24	63.42	32														
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	37	63.01	35														

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	41	70.63	38	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	75	67.57	72	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	82	57.84	80	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83	74.31	80	
	The State provided revised baseline data using FFY 2009 data, therefore OSEP is not comparing FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State met some of its FFY 2009 targets.				
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. [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 39%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 36%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 45%.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%. The State reported that four 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				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that all 114 districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and no districts were excluded from the calculation.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.51%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of .94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 52 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that all 114 districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and no districts were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.90%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.86%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 14 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96.45%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 81.18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>target of 100%. The State reported that all 43 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
<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 of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 53%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, that the remaining five uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State reported that the five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the State’s very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider the State’s FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 25.3% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 55.3% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 73.6% enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in Indicator 15 that 165 of 171 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that two findings were subsequently corrected by February 2010. 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 2007 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. Additionally, the State reported the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in 2006 has not been corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR and 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2007, and the remaining finding identified in FFY 2006, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</p> <p>As to the State’s FFY 2009 data, OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in 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>In reporting on correction of FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	17, 2010.	<p>each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that four of six mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.62%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>