

North Carolina
Table A – Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 7 of its SPP, the State provided baseline data from 2003-2004, rather than the required 2004-2005 baseline data. The State used the earlier data because, although it had 2004-2005 exiting data for students with disabilities, it did not yet have dropout data for nondisabled children.</p>	<p>In the APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must include both updated baseline data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and its first reporting of progress data for this target from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 Memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, the State also needs to explain how the State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>
<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>Noncompliance: The State reported that 58% of children who have been referred by Part C and are eligible for Part B have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. This demonstrates noncompliance with the requirement at 34 CFR §300.132(b). (The State explained that, of the 42% for whom an IEP was not developed and implemented by the child's third birthday, 6% were for reasons not attributable to the school district.)</p>	<p>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 of the IDEA.</p>