

North Carolina 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 56.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 56.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</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 looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 7.1%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 7.69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 8.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 6.0%.</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: 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 25.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 60.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 55%.</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.</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>	<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</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<p>APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and/or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</p>
		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			
	3	99.8%	99.8%	95.0%	99.8%	99.8%	95.0%	
	4	99.9%	99.7%	95.0%	99.8%	99.7%	95.0%	
	5	99.7%	99.8%	95.0%	99.7%	99.8%	95.0%	
	6	99.6%	99.5%	95.0%	99.5%	99.5%	95.0%	
	7	99.3%	99.4%	95.0%	99.2%	99.4%	95.0%	
	8	99.0%	99.3%	95.0%	99.0%	99.2%	95.0%	
	HS	77.0%	74.30%	95.0%	75.6%	70.4%	95.0%	
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results. However, the data posted at the Web link provided by the State do not show that the State met the reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f), for the following reason: the data do not provide the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and/or school levels. The State included in its APR an improvement activity to correct this noncompliance.</p>							

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 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 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:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 480 1593 889"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">38.8%</td> <td align="center">39.3%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">59.3%</td> <td align="center">59.4%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">39.6%</td> <td align="center">49.7%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">57.1%</td> <td align="center">64.2%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">5</td> <td align="center">39.1%</td> <td align="center">48.0%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">54.8%</td> <td align="center">59.2%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">38.8%</td> <td align="center">44.2%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">52.7%</td> <td align="center">55.8%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">7</td> <td align="center">35.1%</td> <td align="center">38.5%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">51.3%</td> <td align="center">53.9%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">8</td> <td align="center">35.4%</td> <td align="center">40.1%</td> <td align="center">43.2%</td> <td align="center">53.3%</td> <td align="center">58.7%</td> <td align="center">77.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">HS</td> <td align="center">25.5%</td> <td align="center">25.1%</td> <td align="center">38.5%</td> <td align="center">42.6%</td> <td align="center">50.0%</td> <td align="center">68.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	38.8%	39.3%	43.2%	59.3%	59.4%	77.2%	4	39.6%	49.7%	43.2%	57.1%	64.2%	77.2%	5	39.1%	48.0%	43.2%	54.8%	59.2%	77.2%	6	38.8%	44.2%	43.2%	52.7%	55.8%	77.2%	7	35.1%	38.5%	43.2%	51.3%	53.9%	77.2%	8	35.4%	40.1%	43.2%	53.3%	58.7%	77.2%	HS	25.5%	25.1%	38.5%	42.6%	50.0%	68.4%	<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>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	38.8%	39.3%	43.2%	59.3%	59.4%	77.2%																																																											
4	39.6%	49.7%	43.2%	57.1%	64.2%	77.2%																																																											
5	39.1%	48.0%	43.2%	54.8%	59.2%	77.2%																																																											
6	38.8%	44.2%	43.2%	52.7%	55.8%	77.2%																																																											
7	35.1%	38.5%	43.2%	51.3%	53.9%	77.2%																																																											
8	35.4%	40.1%	43.2%	53.3%	58.7%	77.2%																																																											
HS	25.5%	25.1%	38.5%	42.6%	50.0%	68.4%																																																											
<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 4.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 3.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 7%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that it has an "n" size of "10 students with disabilities suspended or expelled and/or less than or equal to 1% of an LEA's EC population." However, the State also reported that it reviews data separately for LEAs who do not meet this "n" size to determine whether a significant discrepancy exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any districts from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<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>The State reported that noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</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]</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>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0.47%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 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 one district was 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 it has an “n” size of “10 students with disabilities suspended or expelled and/or less than or equal to 1% of an LEA’s EC population.” However, the State also reported that it reviews data separately for LEAs who do not meet this “n” size to determine whether a significant discrepancy exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any districts from the calculation.</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 LEA identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEA to revise), the LEA’s</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to 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 district identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data has corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps					
	<p>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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEA identified with noncompliance.</p>	<p>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>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for 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>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="550 1385 1583 1490"> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1385 980 1490"></td> <td data-bbox="980 1385 1129 1490"><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></td> <td data-bbox="1129 1385 1281 1490"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></td> <td data-bbox="1281 1385 1430 1490"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></td> <td data-bbox="1430 1385 1583 1490"><u>Progress</u></td> </tr> </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>	<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>			

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</p>	<p>64.1</p>	<p>63.1</p>	<p>64.6</p>	<p>-1.00%</p>	
	<p>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</p>	<p>15.6</p>	<p>15.6</p>	<p>15.7</p>	<p>0.00%</p>	
	<p>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</p>	<p>2.2</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.0</p>	<p>-0.10%</p>	
	<p>These data represent slippage for 5A and 5C and remain unchanged for 5B from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5C.</p>					
<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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 revised baseline data, targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, 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 reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<p align="center"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></p>		

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	88.9	85.9	85.9	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	89.0	86.9	86.9	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.3	86.1	86.1	
	<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) (%)	57.0	48.3	48.3	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	54.1	46.6	46.6	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	67.9	60.6	60.6	
	The State provided revised baseline data, using FFY 2009 data. Therefore, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State met 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 41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 39.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 45%. OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, whether its FFY 2009 data are from				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012. The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2010

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>a group representative of the population, and if not, actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2009 APR the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.</p>	<p>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. [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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial 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 a minimum "n" size of 40 students of the particular race/ethnicity identified in the disability category. The State also reported that it reviewed data separately for LEAs with less than the minimum enrollment/"n" size specified to determine if disproportionate representation exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any districts from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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 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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 30 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no district was 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 a minimum "n" size of 40 students of the particular race/ethnicity identified in the disability category. The State also reported that it reviewed data separately for LEAs with less than the minimum enrollment/"n" size specified to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>determine if disproportionate representation exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any districts from the calculation.</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 90.14%. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator were 90.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 100 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, 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 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</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 birthdays.</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 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 of 29 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining two findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 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</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>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 94.7%.</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>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 §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

North Carolina 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 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>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>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. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 39% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 62% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 73% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<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 93.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 89.05%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 471 of 504 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 25 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR 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 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State 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 findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that 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,</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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. 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 4B, 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 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 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 98%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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 complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152. 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>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</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 two 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>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>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 62.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 72.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 75-85%.</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's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 72%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 80%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 75-85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 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 95.24%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.23%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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 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, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100%</p>

North Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.