

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																												
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 57.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 56.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>																												
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 5.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 7.1%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 6.0 %.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 14.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 25.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 65.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																												
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1300 1583 1495"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">99.8%</td> <td align="center">99.6%</td> <td align="center">95.0%</td> <td align="center">99.8%</td> <td align="center">99.6%</td> <td align="center">95.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">99.7%</td> <td align="center">99.6%</td> <td align="center">95.0%</td> <td align="center">99.7%</td> <td align="center">99.6%</td> <td align="center">95.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	99.8%	99.6%	95.0%	99.8%	99.6%	95.0%	4	99.7%	99.6%	95.0%	99.7%	99.6%	95.0%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																								
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																										
3	99.8%	99.6%	95.0%	99.8%	99.6%	95.0%																								
4	99.7%	99.6%	95.0%	99.7%	99.6%	95.0%																								

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
	5	99.8%	99.5%	95.0%	99.8%	99.5%	95.0%																																																																
	6	99.5%	99.3%	95.0%	99.5%	99.3%	95.0%																																																																
	7	99.4%	99.1%	95.0%	99.4%	99.1%	95.0%																																																																
	8	99.3%	98.9%	95.0%	99.2%	99.0%	95.0%																																																																
	HS	74.3%	84.2%	95.0%	70.4%	87.0%	95.0%																																																																
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>																																																																						
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 683 1583 1094"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>39.3%</td> <td>39.3%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>59.4%</td> <td>59.4%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>49.7%</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>64.2%</td> <td>59.5%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>48.0%</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>59.2%</td> <td>56.1%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>44.2%</td> <td>43.6%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>55.8%</td> <td>56.0%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>38.5%</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>53.9%</td> <td>53.6%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>40.1%</td> <td>38.7%</td> <td>71.6%</td> <td>58.7%</td> <td>59.2%</td> <td>88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>25.1%</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>69.3%</td> <td>50.0%</td> <td>47.9%</td> <td>84.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	39.3%	39.3%	71.6%	59.4%	59.4%	88.6%	4	49.7%	42.1%	71.6%	64.2%	59.5%	88.6%	5	48.0%	42.1%	71.6%	59.2%	56.1%	88.6%	6	44.2%	43.6%	71.6%	55.8%	56.0%	88.6%	7	38.5%	37.5%	71.6%	53.9%	53.6%	88.6%	8	40.1%	38.7%	71.6%	58.7%	59.2%	88.6%	HS	25.1%	25.0%	69.3%	50.0%	47.9%	84.2%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																																			
3	39.3%	39.3%	71.6%	59.4%	59.4%	88.6%																																																																	
4	49.7%	42.1%	71.6%	64.2%	59.5%	88.6%																																																																	
5	48.0%	42.1%	71.6%	59.2%	56.1%	88.6%																																																																	
6	44.2%	43.6%	71.6%	55.8%	56.0%	88.6%																																																																	
7	38.5%	37.5%	71.6%	53.9%	53.6%	88.6%																																																																	
8	40.1%	38.7%	71.6%	58.7%	59.2%	88.6%																																																																	
HS	25.1%	25.0%	69.3%	50.0%	47.9%	84.2%																																																																	
<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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 4.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 6.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy,</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported all districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 10 students with disabilities suspended/expelled and/or &lt; 1% of an LEA’s exceptional child population.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:  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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.47%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 24 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that all districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 10 students with disabilities suspended/expelled and/or &lt; 1% of an LEA’s exceptional child population.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	<u><b>Progress</b></u>	<p>and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63.1	64.8	65.6	1.70%		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.6	14.5	15.3	1.10%		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.3	2.1	2.0	0.20%		
<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 FY 2010 APR.</p>					<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that the State submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for</p>
<p><u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u></p> <p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills</p>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u> 85.9	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u> 79.2	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u> 85.9			

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	(including social relationships) (%)				FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	86.9	79.8	86.9	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.1	79.0	86.1	
	<u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	48.3	41.9	48.3	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.6	41.0	46.6	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	60.6	54.8	60.6	
	The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 43.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 41%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50%.  In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.  OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, whether its FFY 2010 data are				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State provided all of the required information, addressing whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 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 districts were 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>Although the State reported a minimum "n" size requirement of 40 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category identified in special education and related services, the State also reported that data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State to determine if disproportionate representation exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any LEAs from the calculation because an LEA does not meet the minimum "n" size for this indicator."</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 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 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>Although the State reported a minimum "n" size requirement of 40 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category identified in the disability category, the State also reported that data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State to determine if</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	disproportionate representation exists. Therefore, the State does not exclude any LEAs from the calculation because an LEA does not meet the minimum "n" size for this indicator."	
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 91.07%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 90.14%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 143 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 APR,</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 2011 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 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 27 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.3%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 94.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 24 of 25 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that one finding subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
<p>of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 revised the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1084 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">39</td> <td align="center">34</td> <td align="center">39</td> <td align="center">-5.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">62</td> <td align="center">58</td> <td align="center">62</td> <td align="center">-4.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training</td> <td align="center">73</td> <td align="center">70</td> <td align="center">73</td> <td align="center">-3.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	39	34	39	-5.00%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	62	58	62	-4.00%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training	73	70	73	-3.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	39	34	39	-5.00%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	62	58	62	-4.00%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training	73	70	73	-3.00%																		

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	program; or competitively employed					
<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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 93.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 404 of 411 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that five findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR were corrected. When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 98%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on four due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 42.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 62.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 54.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.4%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<b>OSEP Verification Issues</b>		
Critical Element 5: Implementation of Grant Assurances	OSEP’s continuous improvement verification letter (CIV), dated February 29, 2012, required the State to provide, within 60 days of the date of the CIV letter, revised procedures and practices, which are consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.646, for determining whether LEAs have significant disproportionality in the identification of children with disabilities and the identification of children as children with disabilities with a particular impairment. The State provided revised procedures that are consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.646 on April 12, 2012.	The State provided the required revised procedures and no further action is required.