

North Carolina Part B 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 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 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 56.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 49.4%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 55%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 7.79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 6.5%.</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>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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 13.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 35%.</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>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;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1344 1419 1464"> <tr> <td></td> <td>FFY</td> <td>FFY</td> <td>FFY</td> <td>FFY</td> <td>FFY</td> <td>FFY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade</td> <td>2006</td> <td>2007</td> <td>2007</td> <td>2006</td> <td>2007</td> <td>2007</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Data</td> <td>Data</td> <td>Target</td> <td>Data</td> <td>Data</td> <td>Target</td> </tr> </table>		FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY	Grade	2006	2007	2007	2006	2007	2007		Data	Data	Target	Data	Data	Target	<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>
	FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY	FFY																	
Grade	2006	2007	2007	2006	2007	2007																	
	Data	Data	Target	Data	Data	Target																	

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 233 1421 565"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Reading</th> <th colspan="3">Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.0%</td> <td>99.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>99.5%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>99.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>100%</td> <td>96.5%</td> <td>96.0%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>91.8%</td> <td>96.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets.</p>								Reading			Math			3	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%	4	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%	5	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%	6	99.6%	99.2%	99.6%	99.9%	99.1%	99.4%	7	99.4%	99.1%	99.4%	99.9%	99.0%	99.2%	8	99.5%	98.7%	99.3%	99.9%	98.9%	99.3%	HS	100%	96.5%	96.0%	100%	91.8%	96.0%								
	Reading			Math																																																																			
3	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%																																																																	
4	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%	99.9%	99.6%	99.7%																																																																	
5	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%	99.9%	99.7%	99.7%																																																																	
6	99.6%	99.2%	99.6%	99.9%	99.1%	99.4%																																																																	
7	99.4%	99.1%	99.4%	99.9%	99.0%	99.2%																																																																	
8	99.5%	98.7%	99.3%	99.9%	98.9%	99.3%																																																																	
HS	100%	96.5%	96.0%	100%	91.8%	96.0%																																																																	
<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 revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 948 1421 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>55.2%</td> <td>29.6%</td> <td>66.0%</td> <td>49.5%</td> <td>51.6%</td> <td>61.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>58.2%</td> <td>30.6%</td> <td>63.9%</td> <td>44.1%</td> <td>47.7%</td> <td>70.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>62.9%</td> <td>27.1%</td> <td>72.3%</td> <td>40.0%</td> <td>45.3%</td> <td>62.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>51.8%</td> <td>27.6%</td> <td>58.4%</td> <td>37.7%</td> <td>43.0%</td> <td>58.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>56.7%</td> <td>22.3%</td> <td>63.8%</td> <td>35.2%</td> <td>41.0%</td> <td>49.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>60.7%</td> <td>24.3%</td> <td>68.4%</td> <td>36.4%</td> <td>40.9%</td> <td>48.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>85.0%</td> <td>25.3%</td> <td>23.0%</td> <td>27.5%</td> <td>42.3%</td> <td>55.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in math and slippage in reading from the FFY</p>							Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	55.2%	29.6%	66.0%	49.5%	51.6%	61.3%	4	58.2%	30.6%	63.9%	44.1%	47.7%	70.3%	5	62.9%	27.1%	72.3%	40.0%	45.3%	62.9%	6	51.8%	27.6%	58.4%	37.7%	43.0%	58.9%	7	56.7%	22.3%	63.8%	35.2%	41.0%	49.3%	8	60.7%	24.3%	68.4%	36.4%	40.9%	48.3%	HS	85.0%	25.3%	23.0%	27.5%	42.3%	55.6%	<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>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																																	
	Reading			Math																																																																			
3	55.2%	29.6%	66.0%	49.5%	51.6%	61.3%																																																																	
4	58.2%	30.6%	63.9%	44.1%	47.7%	70.3%																																																																	
5	62.9%	27.1%	72.3%	40.0%	45.3%	62.9%																																																																	
6	51.8%	27.6%	58.4%	37.7%	43.0%	58.9%																																																																	
7	56.7%	22.3%	63.8%	35.2%	41.0%	49.3%																																																																	
8	60.7%	24.3%	68.4%	36.4%	40.9%	48.3%																																																																	
HS	85.0%	25.3%	23.0%	27.5%	42.3%	55.6%																																																																	

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2006 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 8%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to demonstrate that the LEAs the State identified in <u>FFY 2004</u> and <u>FFY 2005</u> that had not completed all changes to their policies as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), have now completed the remaining actions. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2006 response table also required the State to 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 <u>FFY 2006</u>, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State provided the required description.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) in the prior year, the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements. The State did not identify any remaining noncompliance for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 which the State found when it conducted the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again 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 the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps					
	<p>ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for one of the five LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for <u>FFY 2007</u>. The State reported that this LEA will be required to make needed revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA.</p> <p>The State reported that four of the five LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007 previously submitted and revised documents pertaining to the suspension and discipline of students with disabilities in those districts, and the State will conduct on site verification visits regarding the implementation of these policies, practices and procedures.</p>						
<p>4. Rates of suspension and 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>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The revised targets are more rigorous in part, and less rigorous in part, than the previously-established targets for 5A, 5B and 5C. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets and requested the revision for ease in reading and to be consistent with other indicators.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1300 1467 1446"> <tr> <td></td> <td>FFY 2006 Data</td> <td>FFY 2007 Data</td> <td>FFY 2007 Target</td> <td>Progress</td> </tr> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	<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>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress			

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps									
	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63.18	64.00	62.6	0.82%									
	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.20	15.8	16.5	0.40%									
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.34	2.3	2.1	0.04%									
	<p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its revised target for 5C.</p>													
<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 special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1133 1419 1377"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="550 1133 1062 1308">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 1133 1180 1308">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 1133 1297 1308">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 1133 1419 1308">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1308 1062 1377">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1308 1180 1377">1</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1308 1297 1377">1</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1308 1419 1377">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1	1	1	<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 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1	1	1											

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	9	9	8	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	32	36	22	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	35	36	36	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23	18	34	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	101.00 %	
	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.				
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]	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 26%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 28%.</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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]	<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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State’s calculation of the data.</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. [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 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 11.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected. The State reported that the remaining 24 LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2005 subsequently corrected the noncompliance; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State reported that all 24 LEAs corrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance within one year.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner and all noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently was corrected.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, the State indicated that, in addition to its examination of the results of the LEA Self-Assessments for Disproportionate Representation, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) staff examined, along with other factors, the age and grade levels of students in the program in determining disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. It is not clear from the information provided in the APR what impact age and grade levels of students in the program has on the determination of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. If the State chooses to continue to include age and grade levels as part of its process for determining whether an LEA has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, the State must clarify in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, how these factors impact its determinations.
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [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 85.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85.44%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 64 of 65 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding subsequently was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected. The State demonstrated in the FFY 2007 APR that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was 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 §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA 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 completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, 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>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 82.35%. These data</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 72.27%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 64 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected. The State reported that the six of six districts that had findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005; and three of three districts that had findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 subsequently corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</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 §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA 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 and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, 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>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 postsecondary goals.</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 85.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 72.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the timely correction of the</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected. The State reported in its FFY 2007 APR that the ten districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>noncompliance reported by the State 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 LEA 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 IEP that includes the required transition content, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75%. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population, and included improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 88.24%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that 717 of 727 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006, including dispute resolution findings of noncompliance, were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that each LEA with uncorrected noncompliance will be required to meet with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) monitor assigned to that LEA and verify that the noncompliant records were corrected by April 15, 2009. Further, each LEA that did not correct all findings of noncompliance was required to review and revise activities in the Continuous Improvement Performance Plan (CIPP) as appropriate by April</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 the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02. In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>15, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that it has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in this indicator from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. The State reported that all ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and all 76 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected.</p>	<p>identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, 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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the correction of noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.67%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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 timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due 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.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on six due process hearings. 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 appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 55.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 75%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75-85%.</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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 68%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 83%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75-85%.</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>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's FFY 2007 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 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).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>