

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 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 revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 56.6%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2007 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</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). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 8.0%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2007 target of 6.5%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 60.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 12%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 45%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), 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 less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="537 898 1409 1482"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.5%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.0%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			3	99.6%	99.8%	95%	99.6%	99.8%	95%	4	99.7%	99.9%	95%	99.6%	99.8%	95%	5	99.7%	99.7%	95%	99.7%	99.7%	95%	6	99.2%	99.6%	95%	99.1%	99.5%	95%	7	99.1%	99.3%	95%	99.0%	99.2%	95%	<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 2009 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target																																													
	Reading			Math																																															
3	99.6%	99.8%	95%	99.6%	99.8%	95%																																													
4	99.7%	99.9%	95%	99.6%	99.8%	95%																																													
5	99.7%	99.7%	95%	99.7%	99.7%	95%																																													
6	99.2%	99.6%	95%	99.1%	99.5%	95%																																													
7	99.1%	99.3%	95%	99.0%	99.2%	95%																																													

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	8	98.7%	99.0%	95%	98.9%	99.0%	95%	
	HS	96.5%	77.0%	95%	91.8%	75.6%	95%	
	<p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/leaperformancearchive/.</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 revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State also revised the targets for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State's revised end target for FFY 2010 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data for reading proficiency for grades 3-8. The State must revise its FFY 2010 targets to reflect improvement.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p>							<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State must revise its FFY 2010 targets to show improvement over the baseline.</p>
	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	
	Reading			Math				
	3	29.6%	38.8%	43.2%	51.6%	59.3%	77.2%	
	4	30.6%	39.6%	43.2%	47.7%	57.1%	77.2%	

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	5	27.1%	39.1%	43.2%	45.3%	54.8%	77.2%	
	6	27.6%	38.8%	43.2%	43.0%	52.7%	77.2%	
	7	22.3%	35.1%	43.2%	41.0%	51.3%	77.2%	
	8	24.3%	35.4%	43.2%	40.9%	53.3%	77.2%	
	HS	25.3%	25.5%	43.2%	42.3%	42.6%	77.2%	
<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 [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/leaperformancearchive/.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 revised reported data for this indicator are 3.3%. OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage, because: (1) as the State explained, the State changed the data source for this indicator, and (2) the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 8.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its revised definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed 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 ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified based on FFY 2007 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not yet corrected because the one year timeline for correction had not yet occurred. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified based on FFY 2007 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it identified noncompliance based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State reported that the LEAs with noncompliance must submit evidence of correction within one year of the finding of noncompliance.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or 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; New for FFY 2009]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<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 2009 APR.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	
	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64.00	64.1	63.6	0.10%	
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.8	15.6	16.1	0.20%	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.3	2.2	2.1	0.10%	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5C.					
<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>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.					The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 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 measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="537 500 1434 1166"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="537 500 909 613">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="915 500 1182 613"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1188 500 1434 613"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 618 909 797">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="915 618 1182 797">88.9</td> <td data-bbox="1188 618 1434 797">57.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 802 909 1013">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="915 802 1182 1013">89.0</td> <td data-bbox="1188 802 1434 1013">54.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 1018 909 1166">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="915 1018 1182 1166">88.3</td> <td data-bbox="1188 1018 1434 1166">67.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	88.9	57.0	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.0	54.1	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.3	67.9	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	88.9	57.0												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.0	54.1												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.3	67.9												
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 39.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 33%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 40%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>												

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided information indicating that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population.</p>	<p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2009 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 33 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State, if it chose 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 categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, clarification as to how these factors impact its determinations. In the FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2008 APR, the State reported that the State “did not use 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 categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Language regarding age and grade levels was not included in its FFY 2008 APR.” The State provided all of the required information.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 90.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 85.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 58 of 64 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining six findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 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 §300.301(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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 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 birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 82.35%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 58 of 64 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining six findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 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 2009 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 2009 APR, the State</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		must review its 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 is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all 48 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 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</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <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>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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89.05%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 98.62%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 423 of 475 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that all 52 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were 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 2009 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 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 noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009, 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 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>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table for this indicator) and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.3%. The State met its FFY 2008 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 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 revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table for this indicator) and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 72.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 55.6%. The State did not meet</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>its FFY 2008 target of 75%-85%.</p>	<p>State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 80%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 68%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.23%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in 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>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>