

# NC Part B

## FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), Exceptional Children Division (ECD) gathered and analyzed data for the development of the Annual Performance Report (APR). Throughout the year, Exceptional Children Division staff met periodically to review and analyze progress made toward the development of the APR. Following discussions, reviews and analyses, staff provided input for use in the continuing development of the APR.

The Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children, the State Advisory Panel, serves as the Stakeholder Steering Committee. Exceptional Children Division staff presented data and information, reviewed progress made, and solicited members' input, as required, toward the development of the APR at the Council's quarterly meeting in December 2016.

By June 1, 2017, the NCDPI-ECD will report to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR will be posted on the NCDPI web page and distributed directly to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). In addition, it will be made available to the media. The ECD will also report on the performance of each LEA on the targets by June 1, 2017. The reports will be posted on the Department's website, will be sent to the LEAs, and distributed to local and regional media. The APR and LEA public reports will be posted at <http://www.nccecas.org/> and the APR will also be posted at <http://ec.ncpublicschools.gov/>.

The FFY 2015 APR contains information specific to measuring progress or slippage against State targets for Indicators 1, 2, 3b-c, 4a-b, 5a-c, 6a-b, 7a-c, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. OSEP approved sampling plans are used for Indicators 8 and 14. North Carolina once again contracted with PEIDRA Services, Inc. to collect and analyze parent involvement data for Indicator 8 and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte to collect and analyze postsecondary outcome data for Indicator 14.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Under its general supervision authority, the NCDPI-EC Division is required to monitor the implementation of all special education programs for all eligible students with disabilities in the state. The federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) monitors the NCDPI-EC Division to ensure that processes and procedures are in place to meet the state's general supervision requirements. To comply with the requirements of this Act, the NCDPI-EC Division has reviewed the mechanisms for monitoring and developed a comprehensive general supervision system. The system:

Supports practices that improve educational results and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities;

Uses multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year after noncompliance is identified; and

Utilizes mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and enforce compliance.

Components of North Carolina's General Supervision System

There are eight components of the General Supervision System, including:

- 1) State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR)
- 2) Policies, Practices, and Procedures
- 3) Dispute Resolution System
- 4) Data Collection
- 5) Monitoring Activities
- 6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions
- 7) Targeted Technical Assistance
- 8) Fiscal Management

Each component, while separate in its description, connects to form a comprehensive system. Through the triangulation of these activities the NCDPI-EC Division complies with federal regulations. Descriptions of the components are included in the attached, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Exceptional Children Division General Supervision Position Paper.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">general supervision paper. 7.14.15.pdf</a>	Nancy Johnson		 Remove

## Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

North Carolina has combined the information about its Technical Assistance/Support and Professional Development Systems.

In previous years, the NCDPI-EC Division provided technical assistance/support and professional development to LEAs in various ways through multiple teams, committees, groups, and individuals. Certain technical assistance (e.g. responding with information to requests by phone or on-site, Regional EC Directors quarterly meetings, etc.) and professional development (semi-annual EC Directors' Institutes, Annual Conference on Exceptional Children for more than 3,000 participants, multi-day and weeklong Summer Institutes by topic and other topical institutes, etc.) have been consistently provided by the ECD over the years.

When the ECD developed its Strategic Vision for the next several years, it also began reviewing its processes for technical assistance and professional development. Through this process some specific needs were identified, including a need for:

- Common processes for TA requests, follow up, and impact assessment
- Refinement of systems of support to utilize/align tiered systems of support (technical assistance and professional development)
- Fidelity measures for all initiatives
- Need for stronger alignment with curriculum standards
- Additional support for developing and providing Specially Designed Instruction (not only training, but implementation, fidelity checks, evaluation of effectiveness)
- Professional Development aligned to identified curricular or program needs and includes provision for high-fidelity
- Implementation (including TA, coaching, program evaluation, etc.)
- Relationships to State Board of Ed. Goals, EC Division Strategic Vision, etc.
- LEA Use of an LEA Self Assessment data to drive customized support

The ECD began to develop its tiered system of technical assistance/support and professional development by including universal, tailored, and customized support for LEAs. The ECD also created an operational definition of its universal work. With a clearly articulated and understood definition of universal supports to LEAs, the ECD can effectively leverage the existing support system to the greatest extent possible. To begin the ECD, with stakeholder involvement, defined critical features of an LEA's EC program that were then consolidated into six core elements of an LEA EC Program: IEP Development and Implementation, Research-Based Instruction and Practices, Policy Compliance, Fiscal Management, Problem-Solving for Improvement, and Communication and Collaboration. The efforts in this area began to converge with identifying and building processes to support LEAs in customized, yet systematic, ways. The ECD was thinking more broadly about the ways each LEA's needs were identified and how LEA support could be most efficiently and effectively provided. As a result, we realized that LEAs required support in the systematic process of problem-solving their own data sources and that it would be necessary to measure implementation of the critical components of an effective EC program. The ECD knew this was going to require building the capability to provide outcome data in accessible and actionable ways to the LEAs. In addition, a way to measure how each LEA worked would also be needed.

Leadership in the Division charged staff with creating an LEA self-assessment process that would place an emphasis on data-driven decision making, and provide information that would be both useful to LEAs in supporting their own growth and providing the ECD the information needed to provide more customized support.

The LEA self-assessment process was built around the six core elements identified and the district's capacity for engaging in systematic problem solving. More process and fidelity data would help the ECD understand how LEAs were doing their work. Just knowing *what* LEAs were doing did not provide the diagnostic information needed to design and provide customized, tiered support. Through the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's (NCDPI) partnership with the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) and the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP), there was an emphasis on ensuring that implementation science informed the work of the entire agency. This included alignment of any new work with existing work and building the knowledge and tools to best support all implementation efforts. To do so, it was critical to define the core components of

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

effective EC programming in a way that was knowable, teachable, and doable. This work was collaboratively completed by state and district-level participants through the development of a practice profile. Subsequently, the document was further refined into a LEA Self-Assessment tool. After several iterations (including 3 rounds of field testing) and a wealth of feedback from LEAs, ECD staff, Curriculum & Instruction staff, and partners from 3 different TA centers (Mid-South RRC, SISEP, PBIS), the ECD has a tool and process that was piloted in each of the State's eight (8) regions during the 2014-15 school year and was rolled out for use at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year. Quarterly Regional EC Directors' meeting during the 2015-16 school year have been devoted to the development of each LEA's Self-Assessment. The Self-Assessments were submitted to NCDPI's EC Division by the end of July 2016.

The LEA Self-Assessment process provides more accessible and actionable data to LEAs; a tool for reviewing and assessing current practice; and a structure for problem identification, priority setting, solution identification and selection, improvement planning, and installation. Completed LEA Self-Assessments yield data for the ECD that have never been readily accessible before. This information describing *how* an LEA is working to implement evidence-based practices facilitated the ECD's identification of the specific types and levels of support an LEA requires. As the ECD reviews the Self-Assessment data and improvement activities selected by the LEAs during the beginning of the 2016-17 school year, this information will drive how the ECD plans to allocate time and resources to support LEAs through technical assistance and professional development. With the additional process information, the ECD will be able to build a continuum of support for LEAs -- providing universal support to all and tailored and/or customized support to those LEAs in need of such support. Comprehensive professional development (e.g., training and coaching) and technical assistance at the intensity level needed to address the LEAs compliance and/or implementation needs will ultimately improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

When the LEA Self-Assessment is implemented, the ECD will use the results to drive customized support for each LEA. This will necessitate refining an internal process flow for planning of professional development, coaching, and technical assistance. The ECD expects to provide customized support through regional staff and team structures, so a common process for comprehensive professional development and technical assistance requests, follow up, and impact assessment will be necessary. In these ways, we expect to refine our systems of both monitoring and support to align with and utilize a tiered system model. Overall, the ECD expects these system refinements to result in improved provision of services for LEAs, strengthened systems of support for students and families, and ultimately improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Please see the Technical Assistance System Section for North Carolina's combined information about its Technical Assistance/Support and Professional Development Systems.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Stakeholder Involvement: ☒ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children, the federally required State Advisory Panel, serves as the Stakeholder Steering Committee for the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. On December 7, 2016 at the Advisory Council's quarterly meeting, Exceptional Children Division staff members presented data and information, reviewed targets and progress made, and solicited members' input as required. Additional groups, that include representatives from the Council, advise the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) on the development of Indicator 17 - State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). A description of these stakeholder groups and their work are described in Indicator 17.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

By June 1, 2017, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), Exceptional Children Division will report to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets of its Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR will be posted on the NCDPI web page and distributed directly to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). In addition, it will be made available to the media. The Exceptional Children Division will also report on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the APR by June 1, 2017. The reports will be posted on the Department's website, will be sent to the LEAs, and distributed to local and regional media. The APR and LEA public reports will be posted at <http://www.nccecas.org/> and the APR will also be posted at <http://ec.ncpublicschools.gov/>.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			50.00%	70.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data		93.90%	49.40%	56.30%	56.80%	56.80%	57.60%	57.20%	59.90%	62.30%	64.40%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update


FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	7,816	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	11,613	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	67.30%	Calculate 

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
7,816	11,613	64.40%	80.00%	67.30%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

North Carolina's 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate is the ratio of youths with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma in 2014-15 or earlier, to all youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2011-12 for the first time.

Youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2011-12 & graduating with a regular diploma in 2014-15 or earlier ÷ All youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2011-12 for the first time X 100 = Percent of youths with IEPs in the state graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate used for youths with IEPs is the same graduation rate calculation and timeline used for all students in North Carolina as established by the Department under the ESEA.

### ☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

North Carolina also calculates a 5-year cohort graduation rate and the 2015-16 5-year cohort data are as follows:

2011-12 entering youths with IEPs, who graduated with a regular diploma in 5 years or less (Numerator)	Number of youths, with IEPs, entering 9th grade for the first time in 2011-12 (Denominator)	Percent of youths, with IEPs, entering 9th grade in 2011-12 and graduating with a regular high school diploma in 5 years or earlier	Change from previous 5-year cohort graduation rate
8,387	11,602	72.3%	+ 2.6 percentage points

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 2: Drop Out**

### Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

## Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			7.00%	6.50%	6.50%	6.00%	6.00%	4.70%	4.70%	4.70%	4.50%
Data		9.21%	7.79%	8.00%	8.00%	7.69%	5.20%	6.00%	5.03%	3.36%	3.77%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	3.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

## FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	2014 FirstMonth20DayMembership for youth with IEPs + Numerator (see formula in explanation of methodology)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,351	50,608	3.77%	4.00%	4.65%

- Use a different calculation methodology

 Change numerator description in data table

☒ Change denominator description in data table

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

In accordance with Option 2, North Carolina used the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data. Data for this indicator are "lag" data.

The definition for dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any to the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

North Carolina uses the same calculation, which is an event rate calculation, for dropout rate for youths with IEPs, as it does for all youth. The rate calculation is listed below using 2014-15 lag data.

$$\text{Rate} = 100 * \text{Numerator} \div (\text{Denominator} + \text{Numerator}) \quad 100 * 2,351 \div (48,257 + 2,351) = 4.65 \text{ or } 100 * 2,351 \div 50,608 = 4.65\%$$

Numerator: Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out

Denominator: 2014 FirstMonth20DayMembership for youth with IEPs + Numerator

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none



FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.60%	99.80%	99.80%	99.60%	99.50%	99.40%	99.66%	99.78%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.70%	99.90%	99.70%	99.60%	99.60%	99.40%	99.59%	99.80%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	99.30%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.70%	99.70%	99.80%	99.50%	99.50%	99.40%	99.69%	99.77%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥				99.60%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.30%	99.60%	99.20%	99.60%	99.50%	99.30%	99.40%	99.10%	99.36%	99.41%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥				99.40%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.10%	99.40%	99.10%	99.30%	99.40%	99.10%	99.10%	99.00%	99.17%	99.41%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥				99.30%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.70%	99.50%	98.70%	99.00%	99.30%	98.90%	99.00%	98.70%	98.98%	99.03%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥				96.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		93.00%	100%	96.50%	77.00%	74.30%	84.20%	97.40%	97.80%	94.96%	96.62%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.60%	99.80%	99.80%	99.60%	99.40%	99.40%	99.68%	99.76%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.60%	99.80%	99.70%	99.60%	99.60%	99.50%	99.59%	99.76%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥				99.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.90%	99.70%	99.70%	99.80%	99.50%	99.50%	99.40%	99.69%	99.75%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥				99.40%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.10%	99.90%	99.10%	99.50%	99.50%	99.30%	99.30%	99.10%	99.27%	99.39%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥				99.20%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.90%	99.90%	99.00%	99.20%	99.40%	99.10%	99.10%	98.90%	99.11%	99.34%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥				99.30%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.60%	99.90%	98.90%	99.00%	99.20%	99.00%	99.00%	98.60%	98.95%	98.99%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥				96.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		95.00%	100%	91.80%	75.60%	70.40%	87.00%	94.00%	93.50%	94.90%	95.34%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☐ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? **yes**

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? **yes**

**Data Source:** SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	16168	16847	16272	15364	15566	15391	n	12984	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3666	3108	2684	2113	2524	2724		2426			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	11241	12477	12385	11960	11742	11268		9113			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								9			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1206	1210	1158	1180	1178	1253		981			

**Data Source:** SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	16168	16847	16271	15363	15566	15392	n	12829	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3641	3103	2657	2120	2465	2659		2625			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	11268	12481	12407	11944	11794	11329		8634			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								65			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1205	1209	1158	1180	1175	1250		981		n	

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	16,168	16,113	99.78%	95.00%	99.66%
B Grade 4	16,847	16,795	99.80%	95.00%	99.69%
C Grade 5	16,272	16,227	99.77%	95.00%	99.72%
D Grade 6	15,364	15,253	99.41%	95.00%	99.28%
E Grade 7	15,566	15,444	99.41%	95.00%	99.22%
F Grade 8	15,391	15,245	99.03%	95.00%	99.05%
G HS	12,984	12,529	96.62%	95.00%	96.50%

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	16,168	16,114	99.76%	95.00%	99.67%
B Grade 4	16,847	16,793	99.76%	95.00%	99.68%
C Grade 5	16,271	16,222	99.75%	95.00%	99.70%
D Grade 6	15,363	15,244	99.39%	95.00%	99.23%
E Grade 7	15,566	15,434	99.34%	95.00%	99.15%
F Grade 8	15,392	15,238	98.99%	95.00%	99.00%
G HS	12,829	12,305	95.34%	95.00%	95.92%

### Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

For participation of students with disabilities (SWD) on state assessments disaggregated by with and without accommodations, use the link:

<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/leaperformancearchive/>

Under Reports in 2015-16 Data Results click on Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations for 2015-16 to view and/or download the report.

For participation of students with disabilities (SWD) on alternate assessments, use the link:

<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/leaperformancearchive/>

Under Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data click on Disaggregated Performance Data for 2015-16 to view and/or download the report. In the type column, the Extend 1 alternate assessment is denoted by X1. In the subgroup column, students with disabilities are denoted by SWD, and the number tested column includes the number of students tested with valid scores.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3	2012	Target ≥				66.00%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		51.00%	55.20%	29.60%	38.80%	39.30%	39.30%	38.70%	17.40%	18.52%	18.38%
	B Grade 4	2012	Target ≥				63.90%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		48.90%	58.20%	30.60%	39.60%	49.70%	42.10%	40.90%	15.00%	14.04%	16.46%
	C Grade 5	2012	Target ≥				72.30%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		57.30%	62.90%	27.10%	39.10%	48.00%	42.10%	42.10%	12.70%	12.48%	13.47%
	D Grade 6	2012	Target ≥				58.40%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		43.40%	51.80%	27.60%	38.80%	44.20%	43.60%	43.20%	12.70%	11.59%	13.17%
	E Grade 7	2012	Target ≥				63.80%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		48.80%	56.70%	22.30%	35.10%	38.50%	37.50%	37.80%	13.30%	12.78%	13.04%
	F Grade 8	2012	Target ≥				68.40%	43.20%	43.20%	71.60%	44.50%	12.90%	21.60%	30.30%
			Data		53.40%	60.70%	24.30%	35.40%	40.10%	38.70%	38.90%	10.10%	9.82%	10.64%
	G HS	2012	Target ≥				23.00%	43.20%	38.50%	69.30%	50.90%	14.00%	22.60%	31.20%
			Data		14.00%	85.00%	25.30%	25.50%	25.10%	25.00%	46.10%	14.40%	15.10%	13.53%
Math	A Grade 3	2012	Target ≥				61.30%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		61.30%	49.50%	51.60%	59.30%	59.40%	59.40%	58.40%	19.30%	19.62%	20.77%
	B Grade 4	2012	Target ≥				70.30%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		70.30%	44.10%	47.70%	57.10%	64.20%	59.50%	59.30%	18.60%	16.90%	19.24%
	C Grade 5	2012	Target ≥				62.90%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		62.90%	40.00%	45.30%	54.80%	59.20%	56.10%	56.30%	15.90%	15.44%	16.79%
	D Grade 6	2012	Target ≥				58.90%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		58.60%	37.70%	43.00%	52.70%	55.80%	56.00%	54.30%	9.70%	9.42%	10.35%
	E Grade 7	2012	Target ≥				49.30%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		49.30%	35.20%	41.00%	51.30%	53.90%	53.60%	53.30%	7.90%	7.48%	8.01%
	F Grade 8	2012	Target ≥				48.30%	77.20%	77.20%	88.60%	59.90%	12.40%	21.20%	30.00%
			Data		48.30%	36.40%	40.90%	53.30%	58.70%	59.20%	59.20%	6.90%	6.35%	7.39%
	G HS	2012	Target ≥				55.60%	77.20%	68.40%	84.20%	51.10%	9.70%	18.70%	27.70%
			Data		43.60%	27.50%	42.30%	42.60%	50.00%	47.90%	45.00%	9.90%	9.56%	10.99%

Key:   Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	B ≥ Grade 4	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	C ≥ Grade 5	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	D ≥ Grade 6	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	E ≥ Grade 7	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	F ≥ Grade 8	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%

Key:

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	39.80%	48.40%	57.00%	57.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	B ≥ Grade 4	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	C ≥ Grade 5	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	D ≥ Grade 6	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	E ≥ Grade 7	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	F ≥ Grade 8	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	G ≥ HS	36.70%	45.70%	54.70%	54.70%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☐ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? **yes**

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? **yes**

**Data Source:** SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	16113	16795	16227	15253	15444	15245	n	12529	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1409	1116	785	606	536	426		407			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	964	1028	884	1045	929	630		770			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level								n			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	589	479	648	494	481	512		461			

**Data Source:** SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	16114	16793	16222	15244	15434	15238	n	12305	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1694	1295	1072	498	461	375		412			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1538	1637	1631	905	693	527		558			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level								n			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	319	490	368	329	186	221		377			

## FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	16,113	2,962	18.38%	39.00%	18.38%
B Grade 4	16,795	2,623	16.46%	39.00%	15.62%
C Grade 5	16,227	2,317	13.47%	39.00%	14.28%
D Grade 6	15,253	2,145	13.17%	39.00%	14.06%
E Grade 7	15,444	1,946	13.04%	39.00%	12.60%
F Grade 8	15,245	1,568	10.64%	39.00%	10.29%
G HS	12,529	1,638	13.53%	39.80%	13.07%

## FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	16,114	3,551	20.77%	38.80%	22.04%
B Grade 4	16,793	3,422	19.24%	38.80%	20.38%
C Grade 5	16,222	3,071	16.79%	38.80%	18.93%
D Grade 6	15,244	1,732	10.35%	38.80%	11.36%
E Grade 7	15,434	1,340	8.01%	38.80%	8.68%
F Grade 8	15,238	1,123	7.39%	38.80%	7.37%
G HS	12,305	1,348	10.99%	36.70%	10.95%

## Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

For performance/proficiency data, where results for all students with disabilities (SWD), including those assessed on regular and alternate assessments, are included in the SWD subgroup use the link: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting>  
Under Reports in 2015-16 Data Results click on 2015-16 State, District and School Level Drilldown Performance Data to view and/or download the report.

For performance/proficiency data, where results for students with disabilities (SWD) are disaggregated by regular and alternate assessments, use the link: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/leaperformancearchive/>  
Under Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data click on Disaggregated Performance Data for 2015-16 to view and/or download the report. In the type column, regular assessments are denoted by RG and the Extend 1 alternate assessment is denoted by X1. In the subgroup column, students with disabilities are denoted by SWD.

☒
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In 2015-16, as in previous years, students with disabilities performed the highest in grade 3 reading (18.38%) and grade 3 math (22.04%) and performed least well in grade 8 reading (10.29%) and grade 8 math (7.37%). Overall students with disabilities and students with disabilities in each disability category performed least well in reading and math in grades 6, 7, and 8.

As required, targets for this indicator are based on achievement standards for levels 4 and 5 which are college and career ready proficiency. However, it's important to identify the data for level 3 that are students who performed at grade level proficiency and with the continuing use of evidence-based strategies may achieve at level 4 or 5 in the future.

5/22/2017

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY2015 Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of children with IEPs at Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency	FFY 2015 Data for Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency
A Grade 3	16113	902	5.6%
B Grade 4	16795	1209	7.2%
C Grade 5	16227	1120	6.9%
D Grade 6	15253	915	6.0%
E Grade 7	15444	1004	6.5%
F Grade 8	15245	899	5.9%
G Grade 10	12529	677	5.4%

FFY2015 Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of children with IEPs at Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency	FFY 2015 Data for Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency
A Grade 3	16114	1692	10.5%
B Grade 4	16793	856	5.1%
C Grade 5	16222	925	5.7%
D Grade 6	15244	*	*
E Grade 7	15434	*	*
F Grade 8	15238	*	*
G Grade 10	12305	812	6.6%

\* < 5%

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none



FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- 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  
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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			9.10%	8.00%	8.00%	7.00%	6.00%	5.00%	5.00%	2.50%	2.50%
Data		2.60%	5.20%	2.30%	2.30%	4.70%	1.90%	2.30%	0.90%	0.44%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State  
☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	252	0%	2.50%	0.40%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- ☒ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State  
☐ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

North Carolina's definition of "significant discrepancy" with regard to suspensions/expulsions for student with IEPs is greater than/equal to twice the State average rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs.

Significant discrepancy = # of students with IEPs with suspensions/expulsions >10 days in school year/# of students with IEPs X 100 = State Average Rate X 2

Suspension and expulsion rates are computed for LEAs with a minimum "n" size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled. Data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum "n" size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum "n" size the LEA is included in the calculation's numerator. Since data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State and accordingly a determination is made about whether or not a significant discrepancy exists, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data for this indicator are on a one year data lag, and there were 252 LEAs in the State during 2014-15.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

One (1) of the 252 LEAs was identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs in 2014-15. In its LEA Self-Assessment submitted to the NCDPI's EC Division in July 2016, the LEA submitted a review of its policies, procedures, and practices pertaining to the suspension and discipline of students with disabilities in the school district, with a particular emphasis on those policies, procedures and practices which involved development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Upon review by EC Division staff, a determination was made that the policies, procedures and practices were compliant and the LEA was not required to make revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements.

☐ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

☐ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

☐ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

☐ The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:



- 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
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	0	252	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

North Carolina's definition of "significant discrepancy" with regard to suspensions/expulsions for student with IEPs is greater than/equal to twice the State average rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs.

Significant discrepancy = # of students with IEPs with suspensions/expulsions >10 days in school year/# of students with IEPs X 100 = State Average Rate X 2

Suspension and expulsion rates, by race or ethnicity, are computed for LEAs with a minimum "n" size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled. Data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum "n" size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum "n" size the LEA is included in the calculation's numerator. Since data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State and accordingly a determination is made about whether or not a significant discrepancy exists, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data for this indicator are on a one year data lag, and there were 252 LEAs in the State during 2014-15.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)



Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

One (1) of the 252 LEAs was identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs in 2014-15. In its LEA Self-Assessment submitted to the NCDPI's EC Division in July 2016, the LEA submitted a review of its policies, procedures, and practices pertaining to the suspension and discipline of students with disabilities in the school district, with a particular emphasis on those policies, procedures and practices which involved development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Upon review by EC Division staff, a determination was made that the policies, procedures and practices were compliant and the LEA was not required to make revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements.

-  The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
-  The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;  
 B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and  
 C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

## Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			61.59%	62.60%	63.60%	64.60%	65.60%	65.60%	65.60%	65.60%	65.50%
		Data		61.56%	63.18%	64.00%	64.10%	63.10%	64.80%	65.70%	66.20%	66.25%	66.45%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.87%	16.50%	16.10%	15.70%	15.30%	15.30%	15.30%	15.30%	15.30%
		Data		16.82%	16.20%	15.80%	15.60%	15.60%	14.50%	13.90%	13.60%	13.55%	13.74%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.18%	2.00%	2.10%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
		Data		2.27%	2.34%	2.30%	2.20%	2.30%	2.10%	2.10%	2.00%	1.98%	1.90%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.40%	65.30%	65.20%	65.00%
Target B ≤	15.20%	15.20%	15.10%	15.00%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

## Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	179,738	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	120,038	null

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	24,924	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	1,912	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	321	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	1,157	null

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	120,038	179,738	66.45%	65.40%	66.78%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	24,924	179,738	13.74%	15.20%	13.87%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,390	179,738	1.90%	2.00%	1.89%

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response**

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2014	Target ≥									51.50%	51.50%	36.70%
		Data								51.00%	49.90%	50.26%	36.65%
B	2014	Target ≤									20.50%	20.50%	21.60%
		Data								21.00%	21.20%	21.98%	21.60%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	37.00%	37.30%	37.60%	38.00%
Target B ≤	21.30%	20.00%	19.70%	19.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	19,070	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</a>	7,038	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	3,859	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	250	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	17	null

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,038	19,070	36.65%	37.00%	36.91%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,126	19,070	21.60%	21.30%	21.64%

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response



FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						85.90%	85.90%	85.90%	86.00%	82.34%	82.34%
		Data					88.90%	85.90%	79.20%	79.30%	82.30%	82.34%	84.80%
A2	2013	Target ≥						48.30%	48.30%	48.30%	48.40%	35.08%	35.08%
		Data					57.00%	48.30%	41.90%	36.50%	39.10%	35.08%	36.71%
B1	2013	Target ≥							86.90%	86.90%	87.00%	82.52%	82.52%
		Data					89.00%	86.90%	79.80%	79.30%	81.30%	82.52%	83.17%
B2	2013	Target ≥						46.60%	46.60%	46.60%	46.70%	34.24%	34.24%
		Data					54.10%	46.60%	79.80%	36.50%	37.60%	34.24%	35.05%
C1	2013	Target ≥						86.10%	86.10%	86.10%	86.20%	81.81%	81.81%
		Data					88.30%	86.10%	79.00%	81.00%	81.30%	81.81%	84.07%
C2	2013	Target ≥						60.60%	60.60%	60.60%	60.70%	52.05%	52.05%
		Data					67.90%	60.60%	54.80%	53.30%	53.60%	52.05%	54.46%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	82.50%	82.50%	82.50%	82.55%
Target A2 ≥	35.20%	35.20%	35.20%	35.40%
Target B1 ≥	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%	82.60%
Target B2 ≥	34.46%	34.46%	34.46%	34.50%
Target C1 ≥	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.20%
Target C2 ≥	52.17%	52.17%	52.17%	52.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	6085.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	50.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	774.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3160.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1637.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	464.00	

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4797.00	5621.00	84.80%	82.50%	85.34%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2101.00	6085.00	36.71%	35.20%	34.53%

### Explanation of A2 Slippage

North Carolina did not meet the target for outcome A2 (percent of children who left the program and met age expected functioning). For Outcome A2 (34.53%) there was a 0.67 percentage point difference between the target and the actual performance. Performance on A2 also dropped by 2.18 percentage points from FFY 2014 (36.71%). This outcome relates to the percent of children who demonstrated the acquisition of positive social relationships to the extent that they left the program functioning at age level expectation.

Feedback received from eight (8) regional Preschool Coordinator Representatives, and the majority of 115 LEA Preschool Coordinators during face-to-face regional Preschool Coordinators meetings in FFY 2015-16, indicated two prevalent issues around Child Outcome Summary ratings and data sharing at the local level: 1) teachers and other staff were entering the COS ratings into the CECAS system, without review, resulting in the lack of oversight of the actual ratings unless LEA leadership regularly ran reports and checked COS rating patterns, and 2) local interagency agreements on data sharing with Part C were not being reviewed and revised annually in most areas of the state, and the local Part C agency case service coordinators did not always know about the agreed-upon data sharing procedures.

To address the first issue, the state provided professional development during FFY 2015-16 to LEA Preschool Coordinators and Directors ("Spring Regional Coordinators Meetings") on how to set up a COS Surveillance system for the purpose of assuring valid and reliable ratings <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/childoutcomesresources>). This system was developed using guidance from the ECTA. The first prong of the three-pronged system focused on "program quality for self-assessment" which related to the need to install a leadership team that reviews the data each year for trends and red flags in COS ratings. The second prong dealt with "data surveillance" which includes what to look for in terms of "red flags" in data patterns and trends which might instigate further evaluation of individual staff ratings. The third prong focused on "individual child file review" steps to ensure that the rating process was completed correctly.

The state also released a state and local data dashboard during the spring of 2016 to provide LEA leaders with data displays and guidance documents on "Understanding Your LEA Data" (see NC data dashboard at <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/north-carolina-state-data-child-outcomes>).

The state continues to provide professional development to LEA administrators, especially new Preschool Coordinators, as a means of improving overall child outcomes. Training materials can be found at: 1) understanding the Child Outcome System <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/outcomes/module-intro>, 2) effective teaching practices to support the NC Early Learning and Development Standards for Social-Emotional Development as a means of improving child outcomes <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/foundations/module-intro> and 3) Developing High Quality Functional IEPs for Pre-K <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/iep/module-intro>. In addition, preschool coordinators and directors were provided with state developed training and technical assistance on understanding the child outcomes data, and how to use those data for program improvement.

An additional piece of work to address Outcomes A2, B2, and C2, around understanding age-expected child development, underway during the 2015-2016 school year was the development of 'learning progressions' that describe the sequence in which young children, birth to 60 months of age, acquire skills in each of the domains of the NC Foundations for Early Learning and Development (NC's early learning standards). This resource will be used in future COS training, to increase the accuracy of individual child ratings and ensure that they are reliable and valid.

## Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	37.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	955.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3062.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1669.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	362.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4731.00	5723.00	83.17%	82.52%	82.67%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2031.00	6085.00	35.05%	34.46%	33.38%

### Explanation of B2 Slippage

There was a 1.08 percentage point difference between the target (34.46%) and the state's actual performance (33.38%) for Outcome B2 and slippage of 1.67 percentage points from FFY 2014 (35.05%). This outcome relates to the percent of children who acquired knowledge and skills such as communication and emergent reading, writing cognitive problem solving, mathematical and scientific thinking, to the extent that they left the program functioning at age level expectations.

Feedback received from eight (8) regional Preschool Coordinator Representatives, and the majority of 115 LEA Preschool Coordinators during face-to-face regional Preschool Coordinators meetings in FFY 2015-16, indicated two prevalent issues around Child Outcome Summary ratings and data sharing at the local level: 1) teachers and other staff were entering the COS ratings into the CECAS system, without review, resulting in the lack of oversight of the actual ratings unless LEA leadership regularly ran reports and checked COS rating patterns, and 2) local interagency agreements on data sharing with Part C were not being reviewed and revised annually in most areas of the state, and the local Part C agency case service coordinators did not always know about the agreed-upon data sharing procedures.

To address the first issue, the state provided professional development during FFY 2015-16 to LEA Preschool Coordinators and Directors ("Spring Regional Coordinators Meetings") on how to set up a COS Surveillance system for the purpose of assuring valid and reliable ratings <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/childoutcomesresources>). This system was developed using guidance from the ECTA. The first prong of the three-pronged system focused on "program quality for self-assessment" which related to the need to install a leadership team that reviews the data each year for trends and red flags in COS ratings. The second prong dealt with "data surveillance" which includes what to look for in terms of "red flags" in data patterns and trends which might instigate further evaluation of individual staff ratings. The third prong focused on "individual child file review" steps to ensure that the rating process was completed correctly.

The state also released a state and local data dashboard during the spring of 2016 to provide LEA leaders with data displays and guidance documents on "Understanding Your LEA Data" (see NC data dashboard at <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/north-carolina-state-data-child-outcomes>).

The state continues to provide professional development to LEA administrators, especially new Preschool Coordinators, as a means of improving overall child outcomes. Training materials can be found at: 1) understanding the Child Outcome System <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/outcomes/module-intro>, 2) effective teaching practices to support the NC Early Learning and Development Standards for Social-Emotional Development as a means of improving child outcomes <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/foundations/module-intro> and 3) Developing High Quality Functional IEPs for Pre-K <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/iep/module-intro>. In addition, preschool coordinators and directors were provided with state developed training and technical assistance on understanding the child outcomes data, and how to use those data for program improvement.

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

An additional piece of work to address Outcomes A2, B2, and C2, around understanding age-expected child development, underway during the 2015-2016 school year was the development of 'learning progressions' that describe the sequence in which young children, birth to 60 months of age, acquire skills in each of the domains of the NC Foundations for Early Learning and Development (NC's early learning standards). This resource will be used in future COS training, to increase the accuracy of individual child ratings and ensure that they are reliable and valid.

To address the need for professional development that addresses Outcome B, the state is currently adapting the professional development modules on early literacy learning developed by AEM Corporation. The adapted modules will promote NC-specific Tier I effective teaching practices in the domain of Language Development and Communication which includes early reading and writing.

### Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	51.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	823.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2109.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2139.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	963.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4248.00	5122.00	84.07%	82.00%	82.94%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3102.00	6085.00	54.46%	52.17%	50.98%

### Explanation of C2 Slippage

There was a 1.19 percentage point difference between the target (52.17%) and the state's actual performance (50.98%) for Outcome C2 and slippage of 3.48 percentage points from FFY 2014 (54.46%). This outcome relates to the percentage of children who demonstrated the ability to get their needs met appropriately to the extent that they left the program functioning at age level expectation.

Feedback received from eight (8) regional Preschool Coordinator Representatives, and the majority of 115 LEA Preschool Coordinators during face-to-face regional Preschool Coordinators meetings in FFY 2015-16, indicated two prevalent issues around Child Outcome Summary ratings and data sharing at the local level: 1) teachers and other staff were entering the COS ratings into the CECAS system, without review, resulting in the lack of oversight of the actual ratings unless LEA leadership regularly ran reports and checked COS rating patterns, and 2) local interagency agreements on data sharing with Part C were not being reviewed and revised annually in most areas of the state, and the local Part C agency case service coordinators did not always know about the agreed-upon data sharing procedures.

To address the first issue, the state provided professional development during FFY 2015-16 to LEA Preschool Coordinators and Directors ("Spring Regional Coordinators Meetings") on how to set up a COS Surveillance system for the purpose of assuring valid and reliable ratings <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/childoutcomesresources>). This system was developed using guidance from the ECTA. The first prong of the three-pronged system focused on "program quality for self-assessment" which related to the need to install a leadership team that reviews the data each year for trends and red flags in COS ratings. The second prong dealt with "data surveillance" which includes what to look for in terms of "red flags" in data patterns and trends which might instigate further evaluation of individual staff ratings. The third prong focused on "individual child file review" steps to ensure that the rating process was completed correctly.

The state also released a state and local data dashboard during the spring of 2016 to provide LEA leaders with data displays and guidance documents on "Understanding Your LEA Data" (see NC data dashboard at <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/north-carolina-state-data-child-outcomes>).

The state continues to provide professional development to LEA administrators, especially new Preschool Coordinators, as a means of improving overall child outcomes. Training materials can be found at: 1) understanding the Child Outcome System <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/outcomes/module-intro>, 2) effective teaching practices to support the NC Early Learning and Development Standards for Social-Emotional Development as a means of improving child outcomes <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/foundations/module-intro> and 3) Developing High Quality Functional IEPs for Pre-K <http://modules.nceln.fpg.unc.edu/iep/module-intro>. In addition, preschool coordinators and directors were provided with state developed training and technical assistance on understanding the child outcomes data, and how to use those data for program improvement.

An additional piece of work to address Outcomes A2, B2, and C2, around understanding age-expected child development, underway during the 2015-2016 school year was the development of 'learning progressions' that describe the sequence in which young children, birth to 60 months of age, acquire skills in each of the domains of the NC Foundations for Early Learning and Development (NC's early learning standards). This resource will be used in future COS training, to increase the accuracy of individual child ratings and ensure that they are reliable and valid.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			26.00%	28.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data			26.00%	33.00%	39.20%	41.00%	43.30%	44.20%	44.20%	46.37%	43.83%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
971.00	2101.00	43.83%	50.00%	46.22%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) used a 25-item survey with a rating scale, the *Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale* (SEPPS), developed and validated previously by the National Center for Special Education Accountability (NCSEAM). For parents of children ages 5-21, NCDPI uses the NCSEAM 25-item Part B Survey Form 2.0 that addresses family involvement. For parents of preschool children, NCDPI uses the NCSEAM 25-item Preschool 619 Survey. Each family selected to participate in the annual sample receives a survey printed on an optical scan form accompanied by a cover letter explaining the importance of the survey and guaranteeing the confidentiality of the parent's responses. The packet also includes a pre-addressed, postage-prepaid envelope for the return of the survey. Data from the surveys of families of children ages 3-21 are scanned into an electronic database. The database is then sent to PEIDRA Data Services which analyzes the data and produces reports at both the state and LEA level. North Carolina adheres to the standard recommended by NCSEAM's national stakeholder group in calculating the percentage of parents with measures at or above a level indicating their perception that schools facilitated their involvement. Two versions of the SEPPS rating scale were used: one for parents of children with disabilities in grades K-12 and one for parents of preschool children with disabilities. The items on each scale were fully equated in the development phases so that the measures on the two scales have the same meaning, the same standard applies, and measures from the two scales can be aggregated. NCDPI aggregated the measures from the two scales.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

A total of 17,173 surveys (13,386 school-age and 3,787 preschool) were shipped to forty-two (42) LEAs sampled across the state of North Carolina. A total of 2,101 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 12.23%. This was an increase of 0.38 percentage point from the previous year's response rate.

A comparison of the respondents in the annual sample to the representative survey distribution, suggests that the following response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

groups did not match the representative sample surveyed. To offset the underrepresentation in the response group, the NCDPI oversampled in the survey distribution. The oversampling impacted the overall response rate and somewhat impacted the response rates of under-represented groups, as identified below.

a) The FFY 2014 data suggest that African-American students were under-represented (22.0%) while white students were over-represented (58.0%) and other races were slightly over-represented in the survey results as compared to surveys distributed. This was similar to previous years.

Distribution by Race			
Surveys	African - American	White	Other
Distributed	30.8%	52.0%	17.2%
Returned	22.0%	58.0%	20.0%

b) In FFY 2015, preschool children were over-represented (28.0%), while students in grades K-12 were under-represented (72.0%) as compared to surveys distributed. This gap widened from previous years.

Distribution by Grade		
Surveys	Preschool	School-Age
Distributed	21.0%	79.0%
Returned	28.0%	72.0%

c) In FFY 2015, students with autism (13.0%) and developmental delays (20.0%) were over-represented while students with specific learning disabilities (23.0%) were under-represented and students with intellectual disabilities (7.5%), speech-language impairments (20.0%) and other disability categories (4.5%) were slightly under-represented as compared to surveys distributed.

Distribution by Disability								
Surveys	Autism	Developmental Delay	Intellectual Disability	Other Health Impairment	Specific Learning Disability	Speech-Language Impairment	Other	Missing
Distributed	7.3%	12.2%	9.3%	14.1%	28.9%	21.6%	6.6%	0.0%
Returned	13.0%	18.0%	7.5%	14.0%	23.0%	20.0%	4.5%	0.0%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

☒ Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

☐ No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) used a 25-item survey with a rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated previously by the National Center for Special Education Accountability (NCSEAM). For parents of children ages 5-21, NCDPI uses the NCSEAM 25-item Part B Survey Form 2.0 that addresses family involvement. For parents of preschool children, NCDPI uses the NCSEAM 25-item Preschool 619 Survey. Five (5) Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with an average enrollment of 50,000 students or more are included in the annual sampling plan. Additionally, approximately one-fifth of the remaining districts balanced by size and location with consideration for race/ethnicity, grade level and disability category are included in the sample each year.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation



Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
- ☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	0	275	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In North Carolina, disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education is defined as a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$ .

To determine the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction:

1. Identifies districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, by using the First Month Race and Gender Enrollment data and the December 1 Periodic Child Count data in Westat’s Disproportionality Excel Spreadsheet Application;

One (1) LEA had disproportionate representation in 2015-16, which is determined by a risk ratio of  $\geq 3^*$ . Since one (1) LEA was identified with disproportionate representation, the NCDPI completed steps 2 and 3.

\* Risk ratios are computed for LEAs with a minimum of 30 students (same as AMO subgroup) of the particular race/ethnicity identified in special education and related services. Data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum enrollment/”n” size specified to determine if disproportionate representation exists. If determined that disproportionate representation exists for an LEA with less than the minimum "n" size the LEA is included in the calculator's numerator. Since data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State and accordingly a determination is made about whether or not disproportionate representation exists, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

2. Surveyed the LEA with disproportionate representation, using a State-developed LEA Self-Assessment or an updated self-assessment if previously completed, which examined local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d); and

3. Examined the results of the LEA Self-Assessment along with other factors such as risk ratio trend data and student record reviews to make a determination about whether or not the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification.

Using these steps to examine the data, zero (0) LEAs in 2015-16, or 0% had disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
in special education and related services that was a result of inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation



Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
- ☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
25	0	275	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In North Carolina, disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is defined as a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$ .

To determine the number of districts with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction:

1. Identifies districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, by using the First Month Race and Gender Enrollment data and the December 1 Periodic Child Count data in Westat's Disproportionality Excel Spreadsheet Application;

Twenty-five (25) LEAs had disproportionate representation in specific disability categories in 2015-16 which is determined by a risk ratio of  $\geq 3^*$  of a racial/ethnic group in a specific disability category. For the districts identified with disproportionate representation, the NCDPI completed steps 2 and 3.

\* Risk ratios are computed for LEAs with a minimum of 30 students (AMO subgroup size) of the particular race/ethnicity identified in the disability category. Data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum enrollment specified to determine if disproportionate representation exists. If determined that disproportionate representation exists for an LEA with less than the minimum "n" size the LEA is included in the calculation's numerator. Since data are reviewed for all LEAs in the State and accordingly a determination is made about whether or not disproportionate representation exists, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

2. Surveyed LEAs with disproportionate representation, using a State-developed LEA Self-Assessment or an update of the self-assessment, which is an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d); and

3. Examined the results of the LEA Self-Assessment along with other factors such as: risk ratio trend data and student record reviews, to make a determination about whether or not the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.



**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Using these steps to examine the data, zero (0) districts in 2015-16, or 0% had disproportionate representation, in racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, that was a result of inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings****Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find



Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		84.62%	85.44%	85.50%	90.70%	90.14%	91.07%	92.41%	93.30%	92.82%	92.52%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
42,348	38,771	92.52%	100%	91.55%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	3,577
---	-------

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.


Range of days beyond 90 days -

1-5 days -	643
6-15 days -	661
16-25 days -	434
26-35 days -	326
36-45 days -	257
46 days or more -	1,256
Total -	3,577

Reasons for delays/referrals that went beyond the 90 day timeline -

Referral paperwork not processed in a timely manner -	1,756
Excessive student absences -	67
Weather delays -	101
Dealay in getting parent consent for evaluation -	271
Other -	1,382
Total -	3,577

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

 The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.

5/22/2017

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The 2015-16 data were collected for all LEAs through the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS). Allowable exceptions, that were removed from the number of referrals received, were included in CECAS as follows: children who transferred in or out of the LEA, dropped out, or died within 90 days of receipt of referral; children who transferred into the LEA after the 90 day timeline expired; and children whose parent(s) repeatedly failed or refused to produce them for the evaluation.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
127	126	1	0

### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The 127 LEAs with findings of non-compliance were required to access the reports tool in the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS), or another electronic system for the few LEAs only using CECAS to report data, and update their data, at a minimum on a quarterly basis in order for the EC Division to review new data/student records to verify that each LEA with non-compliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. Any LEA whose data were non-compliant in the first quarter was reviewed on a quarterly basis or sooner, and was required to submit data/evidence to NCDPI's EC Division of any changes made to improve processes as part of correcting non-compliance prior to the EC Division reviewing additional new records in a subsequent quarterly review. During this time, the EC Division provided additional technical assistance, prior to the review of new data/student records, to LEAs that had low compliance rates. Upon review of the new data/student records for the 127 LEAs with findings of non-compliance, the EC Division has verified that the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The 127 LEAs with non-compliant findings had 4,616 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2014-15. At the time of the initial determination of compliance for Indicator 11, the EC Division verified that the LEAs with non-compliance also submitted/updated data/evidence through the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS) that 3,146 child specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. LEAs were also required to submit data/evidence through CECAS to the NCDPI, as soon as possible and no later than one year from notification of the non-compliant findings, that the remaining 1,470 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. EC Division staff reviewed the submitted data/evidence through CECAS and verified that the required determinations had been completed for all child-specific instances of non-compliance.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		48.40%	72.27%	82.35%	92.80%	94.00%	94.91%	96.53%	97.75%	98.09%	98.84%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	6,637
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	811
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,021
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2,651
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	84

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
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. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	3,021	3,091	98.84%	100%	97.74%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	70
--	----

Explanation of Slippage

In FFY 2014, there were 6,374 children referred from Part C with 36 children who did not receive a timely transition. In FFY 2015 there were 6,637 referred from Part C with 70 children who did not receive timely transition. North Carolina's transition data of 97.7% indicated a slippage of 1.10 percentage points from FFY 2014 (98.84%). Sixteen (16) of eighteen (18) LEAs with non-compliant findings demonstrated slippage. Ten (10) of the LEAs demonstrated compliance between 90.9% and 99.9% and eight (8) demonstrated compliance of <90%.

The slippage occurred largely due to **Part B Circumstances**. Forty-five (45%) of reported delays fell in the "Part B Circumstance" category (n=32), representing an increase of 22 incidences from FFY 2014 (n=10). LEAs have reported that state funding cuts to education in North Carolina since 2013 have resulted in a reduction in their capacity to complete timely evaluations and hold timely IEP meetings.

Feedback received from eight (8) regional Preschool Coordinator Representatives, and the majority of 115 LEA Preschool Coordinators during face-to-face regional Preschool Coordinators meetings during FFY 2015-16, indicated the need to revise/revitalize the interagency agreement process called the "Catchment Area Transition Plan" which was installed in 2011. A review of these agreements indicated that many of the plans were out of date and therefore contained misinformation. Reportedly, many infant-toddler service coordinators did not know about these plans nor the agreed-upon procedures for transition outlined in these plans.

To improve data sharing at the local and state level, the State Part C and Part B 619 IDEA programs have joined a national project to link C and 619 Data through technical assistance by The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy). The project is now in the process of developing an MOU around data sharing to ease the burden placed on the local Part C and B agencies, to ensure reliable and valid child notification data. As part of that project, a revision the local interagency transition agreements ("Catchment Area Transition Plans"), mentioned above, are now being revised and implemented with new guidance. A stakeholder review process is projected for 2016-17 with the target of implementation in the summer of 2017.

Additionally, the Department continues to provide professional development for LEA early childhood diagnostic teams on developmentally and culturally appropriate and diagnostic practices for comprehensive evaluations, evaluations specific to early childhood Autism, and in conducting early childhood vision screening. There is also an established Preschool Assessment Demonstration Team Project that provide technical assistance and demonstration of best practices in diagnostics to LEA teams. The professional development and demonstration project is facilitated through the 619 funded professional development and technical assistance project, the Early Learning Network (<http://ncline.fpg.unc.edu/>), and contracts with NC Prevent Blindness and the TEAACH program at UNC Chapel Hill. In addition, the Department has developed guiding practice documents on early childhood transition, vision and hearing screening (<http://ncline.fpg.unc.edu/ec-preschool-coordinator-resources-guiding-practices>) to assist in the improvement and efficiency of LEAs practices.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Number of students delayed beyond 3rd birthday the following number of days -  
5/22/2017

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1 to 5 - 11

6 to 15 - 22

16 to 25 - 11

26 to 35 - 11

36 to 45 - 3

46 days or more - 12

Total - 70

### Total number of students delayed due to the following reasons -

a. Family Circumstance (e.g. illness/death in family, change in custody, etc.) - 17

b. Child Circumstance (e.g., child was sick) - 16

c. Part B Circumstance (delays related to completion of evaluations, holding timely meeting, arranging transportation, school enrollment paperwork, etc.) - 32

d. Part C Circumstance (delays relating to Part C failing to notify or issue transition planning meeting invitation to Part B in a timely manner when child was in Part C system prior to 2 years, 9 months of age) - 5

Total - 70

### What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

### Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data used to report on this indicator includes statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that provides special education and related services to the preschool-age population. Data were not obtained by sampling. The Department created Excel spreadsheets with the required data collection fields which automatically calculated the percentage of timely transitions. Each LEA was required to have its Exceptional Children Director sign an assurance as to the accuracy of the data. Spreadsheets were submitted electronically to the Department. The Department also created an optional spreadsheet to assist LEAs in tracking the referral and placement dates for each student.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	15	0	0

### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

All fifteen (15) LEAs with non-compliant findings submitted the following documentation that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements: 1) the signed local interagency agreement "Catchment Area Transition Plan"; 2) Infant Toddler to Preschool Program Notification Spreadsheet for children referred from August to March 2015, and 3) new Indicator 12 data for the first quarter of 2016. EC Division consultants reviewed the new data and information and verified that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The fifteen (15) LEAs with non-compliant findings had thirty-six (36) child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2014-15. At the time of the initial determination of compliance for Indicator 12, the EC Division verified that the LEAs with non-compliance also submitted/updated data/evidence that twenty-five (25) child specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. Eight (8) LEAs were also required to submit data/evidence to the NCDPI, as soon as possible and no later than one year from notification of the non-compliant findings, that the remaining eleven (11) child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. EC Division staff reviewed the submitted data/evidence and verified that the required determinations had been completed for all child-specific instances of non-compliance.



## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						94.70%	94.30%	89.90%	64.40%	85.07%	88.42%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline



#### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
327	371	88.42%	100%	88.14%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

During the 2015-16 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in ( ) traditional LEAs and charter schools with students age 16 and above. Monitoring consultants and other EC Division staff members conducted the Program Compliance Reviews. When reviewing records to determine compliance with Indicator 13, staff used the EC Division's Special Education Student Record Review Protocol with compliance items based on The Indicator 13 checklist, developed by the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC).

#### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Eighteen (18) of the thirty-seven (37) LEAs with Program Compliance Reviews and students with disabilities, ages 16 and older, had findings of non-compliance in one or more student records. NCDPI staff reviewed additional (new) student records for each of the eighteen (18) LEAs where non-compliance was identified and verified that all of the non-compliance had been systemically corrected in each LEA. NCDPI reviewed the new student records while on-site in the LEA or electronically through CECAS.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

Eighteen (18) of thirty-seven (37) LEAs with Program Compliance Reviews and students with disabilities, ages 16 and older, had findings of non-compliance in one or more student records. The LEAs that had identified non-compliance were required to submit a copy of each student's IEP that documented the correction of student specific noncompliance (22 individual student records) for NCDPI review and verification. If an IEP(s) could be accessed electronically through CECAS, the NCDPI Monitoring Consultants verified correction using the electronic submission/version of the IEP(s).



# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							39.00%	39.00%	39.50%	39.50%	39.50%
		Data						39.00%	34.00%	29.00%	31.00%	29.77%	31.88%
B	2009	Target ≥							62.00%	62.00%	62.50%	62.50%	62.50%
		Data						62.00%	58.00%	57.00%	57.00%	54.45%	61.11%
C	2009	Target ≥							73.00%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	73.50%
		Data						73.00%	70.00%	66.00%	63.00%	68.96%	72.71%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	39.50%	39.50%	39.75%	40.00%
Target B ≥	62.50%	62.50%	62.75%	63.00%
Target C ≥	73.50%	73.50%	73.75%	74.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	336.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	129.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	112.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	9.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	12.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	129.00	336.00	31.88%	39.50%	38.39%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	241.00	336.00	61.11%	62.50%	71.73%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	262.00	336.00	72.71%	73.50%	77.98%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

North Carolina contracted with the University of North Carolina-Charlotte (UNC-C) to collect the post-school outcomes data for the SPP/APR. North Carolina conducts a sampling of local education agencies (LEAs), charter schools and State Operated Programs(SOPs). A sampling calculator developed by the National Post-school Outcomes Center was used by UNC-C to establish representative samples through fiscal year 2020-21. District level information was entered into the Sampling Calculator and a sampling of districts, based on a multi-way cluster model, was produced. Samples were equivalent for size of district, percentage of females, students with disabilities, and minority race. All LEAs are sampled at least once every five years. The five LEAs with an Average Daily Membership (ADM) of 50,000 or more are sampled each year. Students in the sample include those who graduated with a regular diploma, aged out, received a certificate, dropped out, or were expected to return but did not. This is the same sampling process North Carolina has used previously. New individual schools were added to the sampling plan which was submitted with the FFY2014 APR. Individual schools incorporated into the sampling plan included new high schools in the five LEAs with an ADM of 50,000 or more and charter schools that received approval to expand their charters to include high school grades.

A total of 2,990 Exiters were included in the 2016 follow-up survey of the 2014-2015 school Exiters. A total of 414 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 13.85%. To examine potential nonresponse bias, a comparison of the known characteristics of all 2014-2015 Exiters to the characteristics of those who completed the survey was conducted. The response rate was representative about gender, race, and some disability categories (specific learning disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and serious emotional disabilities). Students with other disabilities were slightly over-represented in the response rate (+ 4%). This sample of Exiters who completed the survey is over-represented by those who graduated and under-represented by those who dropped out. The sample of Exiters who completed the survey is also over-represented by those who graduated (+ 31%) and under-represented by those who dropped out (- 10%). This potential nonresponse bias, regarding those who graduated and those who dropped out, is similar to previous years' discrepancies between the population and sample.

To address concerns regarding response rates, North Carolina conducted a pilot with five (5) LEAs that agreed to make their own post-school follow-up calls. After training by NCDPI and the contractor, the number of students with contact information from each LEA were divided in half and the contractor called 50% and the LEA called the other 50%. Four (4) of the five (5) LEAs collected their own data. Three (3) of the four (4) LEAs had significantly better response rates than the overall response rate (27%, 57%, and 54%) and two (2) of the four (4) LEAs had better response rates than the contractor. Reasons for the better response rates included, but were not limited to: receiving post-school follow-up calls from local/recognized phone number(s) rather than an unknown phone number; speaking to a person(s) in the LEA who know the Exiters know; and capability of the LEAs to follow-up through other means, if necessary, to contact the Exiters.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target			-		86.00%	-	86.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data		86.00%			75.00%			55.60%			72.10%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012			2013		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	62.80%			42.86%			42.42%			48.15%			50.00%		

FFY	2014		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	16.67%		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	21	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	43	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
21	43	16.67%	75.00% - 85.00%	48.84%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

# FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target			-		84.00%	-	84.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data		71.00%			83.00%			68.00%			80.00%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012			2013		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	71.80%			54.50%			75.68%			83.78%			77.27%		

FFY	2014		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	65.71%		


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	16	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	24	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	65	null

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
16	24	65	65.71%	75.00% - 85.00%	61.54%

### Explanation of Slippage

North Carolina's data indicated that during the 2015-16 school year there continued to be a decrease in the use of early resolution processes such as Facilitated IEP meetings and requests for mediation prior to requesting a due process hearing. Data also showed that for several due process hearing requests, where agreements were not achieved through mediation, parents were represented by a few of the same individuals/groups (attorneys and/or advocacy representatives). Feedback from participants involved in mediations, as well as other anecdotal information gathered during various stakeholder meetings throughout the year, indicated that in some instances there was a lack of interest to resolve disagreements during mediations, and the intent was only to complete the process in order to go to due process hearings and/or collect attorney fees. North Carolina continues to analyze its data more closely regarding various aspects of the dispute resolution process, including: access to high quality attorneys for families with low-income if attorneys' fees were not available; training and qualifications of mediators and individuals conducting facilitated IEP meetings; and other means of communication to encourage the use of early resolution processes.

Additionally, the State is piloting a program to train individuals in selected LEAs to implement early resolution processes with the opportunity share trained individuals across LEAs to assist in a neutral way with early resolution of disagreements.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥			
Data			

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Description

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

## FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Dr. Nancy T. Johnson

Title: SPP/APR Coordinator

Email: ntjohnso@uncc.edu

Phone: 704-576-2760