

NC Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2016 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 2017.

By June 1, 2018, 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, 2018. 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 2016 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. North Carolina uses 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. For the first time each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, collected and submitted its data to the NCDPI-ECD. As a result, the number of responses to the survey increased significantly, from 336 responses in FFY 2015 to 979 responses in FFY 2016 for a response rate of 45.66%.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

287

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
7-2015 general supervision position paper1.15.15 final.docx	Nancy Johnson		

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.

The NCDPI-EC Division has 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 abd Regional EC Directors quarterly meetings) 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 have been consistently provided by the EC Division over the years.

When the EC Division developed its Strategic Vision for the next several years, it reviewed 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 and progress monitoring (not only training, but implementation, fidelity checks, evaluation of effectiveness)
- Professional Development aligned to identified curricular or program needs which includes provisions for high-fidelity
- Program implementation (including TA, coaching, and program evaluation)
- Relationships to State Board of Education Goals and the EC Division Strategic Vision
- Use of LEA Self Assessment data to drive customized support

The EC Division developed 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.

The EC Division, 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: Policy Compliance, Fiscal Management, IEP Development and Implementation, Research-Based Instruction and Practices, Problem-Solving for Improvement, and Communication and Collaboration. 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 EC Division 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. The LEA self-assessment process places an emphasis on data-driven decision making, and provides information that is both useful to LEAs in supporting their own growth and providing the EC Division 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 EC Division 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 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, EC Division staff, Curriculum & Instruction staff, and partners from 3 different TA centers (Mid-South RRC, SISEP, PBIS), the EC Division 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 were devoted to the development of each LEA's Self-Assessment. The initial LEA Self-Assessments were submitted to NCDPI's EC Division by the end of July 2016. Following implementation and a review of updated data, LEAs submit LEA Self-Assessment updates annually.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 EC Division's identification of the specific types and levels of support an LEA requires. Information gleaned from EC Division reviews of the LEA Self-Assessment data and improvement activities selected by the LEAs during the beginning of the 2016-17 school year helped drive how the EC Division allocates time and resources to support LEAs through technical assistance and professional development. With the additional process information, the EC Division built 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.

With the implementation of the LEA Self-Assessment process, the EC Division has used the results to drive customized support for each LEA. This necessitated refining an internal process flow for planning of professional development, coaching, and technical assistance. The EC Division provides 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 was necessary and resulted in the development of an electronic professional development catalog that includes all of the professional development offered annually by the EC Division. 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 13, 2017 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.			

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

By June 1, 2018, 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, 2018.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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/>. Click on the LEA APRs 2016-17 tab at the top for the APR-2016B-NC and its accompanying attachments. A link to the APR will also be posted at <http://ec.ncpublicschools.gov/>. Click on the State Performance Plan on the left side of the page and then click on the links provided for the 2016-2017 school year.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

--

**FFY 2016 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 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	80.00%
Data	67.30%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

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 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	8,041	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	11,665	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.90%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
8,041	11,665	67.30%	80.00%	68.90%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

North Carolina's 4-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is the ratio of youths with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma in 2015-16 or earlier, to all youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2012-13 for the first time.

Youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2012-13 & graduating with a regular diploma in 2015-16 or earlier - All youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2012-13 for the first time X 100 = Percent of youths with IEPs in the state graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

The 4-Year Adjusted 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

North Carolina also calculates a 5-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate and the 2016-17 **5-year cohort data** are as follows:

2012-13 entering youths with IEPs, who graduated with a regular diploma in 5 years or less (Numerator) - **8,525**

Number of youths, with IEPs, entering 9th grade for the first time in 2012-13 (Denominator) - **11,665**

Percent of youths, with IEPs, entering 9th grade in 2012-13 and graduating with a regular high school diploma in 5 years or earlier - **73.1%**

Change from previous 5-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate: **+ 0.8 percentage points**

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	4.00%
Data	4.65%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,280	56,012	4.65%	3.50%	4.07%

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.

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 2015-16 lag data. Rate = 100 * Numerator ÷ (Denominator + Numerator) 100 * 2,280 ÷ (53,732 + 2,280) = 4.07% or 100 * 2,280 ÷ 56,012 = 4.07%
Numerator: Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out Denominator: 2015 FirstMonth20DayMembership for youth with IEPs + Numerator

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The definition for dropout in North Carolina 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.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 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. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.66%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.69%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.72%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.28%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.22%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.05%

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name		FFY	2015
	G HS	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	96.50%
	A Grade 3	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.67%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.68%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.70%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.23%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.15%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.00%
Math	G HS	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	95.92%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	16094	16838	16902	15595	15094	15263	n	13770	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4540	3888	3640	3648	3187	3474		3398			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10257	11653	11940	10682	10564	10365		8885			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								n			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1231	1236	1262	1158	1198	1268		1049			

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	16094	16837	16902	15596	15093	15264	n	13594	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3971	3236	2934	3025	2700	3101		2896			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10832	12299	12646	11307	11052	10736		9177			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								8			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1228	1237	1262	1157	1198	1267		1048			

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	16,094	16,028	99.66%	95.00%	99.59%
B Grade 4	16,838	16,777	99.69%	95.00%	99.64%
C Grade 5	16,902	16,842	99.72%	95.00%	99.65%
D Grade 6	15,595	15,488	99.28%	95.00%	99.31%
E Grade 7	15,094	14,949	99.22%	95.00%	99.04%
F Grade 8	15,263	15,107	99.05%	95.00%	98.98%
G HS	13,770	13,334	96.50%	95.00%	96.83%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	16,094	16,031	99.67%	95.00%	99.61%
B Grade 4	16,837	16,772	99.68%	95.00%	99.61%
C Grade 5	16,902	16,842	99.70%	95.00%	99.65%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
D Grade 6	15,596	15,489	99.23%	95.00%	99.31%
E Grade 7	15,093	14,950	99.15%	95.00%	99.05%
F Grade 8	15,264	15,104	99.00%	95.00%	98.95%
G HS	13,594	13,129	95.92%	95.00%	96.58%

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 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations click on the xlsx file for 2016-2017 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 2016-17 to view and/or download the report, that includes two documents. One document provides a description of files and codes used. The other document contains the data for each LEA, school, and the State. 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. In order to download and/or open the zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary, a different web browser may be used, or the web link may need to be copied and pasted into the browser.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

During the FFY 2015 clarification period, North Carolina's APR was updated to include the correct web links that demonstrate the State has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), as follows:

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 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations click on the xlsx file for 2015-2016 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, that includes two documents. One document provides a description of files and codes used. The other document contains the data for each LEA, school, and the State. 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. In order to download and/or open the zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary, a different web browser may be used, or the web link may need to be copied and pasted into the browser.

FFY 2016 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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	18.38%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	15.62%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	14.28%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	14.06%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	12.60%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	39.00%
		Data	10.29%

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name		FFY	2015
	G HS	Target ≥	39.80%
		Data	13.07%
	A Grade 3	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	22.04%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	20.38%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	18.93%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	11.36%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	8.68%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	38.80%
		Data	7.37%
Math	G HS	Target ≥	36.70%
		Data	10.95%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY		2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	B ≥ Grade 4	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	C ≥ Grade 5	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	D ≥ Grade 6	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	E ≥ Grade 7	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	F ≥ Grade 8	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
	G ≥ HS	48.40%	57.00%	57.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	B ≥ Grade 4	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	C ≥ Grade 5	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	D ≥ Grade 6	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	E ≥ Grade 7	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	F ≥ Grade 8	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
	G ≥ HS	45.70%	54.70%	54.70%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

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	16028	16777	16842	15488	14949	15107	n	13334	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1515	1107	828	804	661	478		584			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	841	869	806	936	835	535		709			
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	617	488	708	485	486	522		491			

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

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	16031	16772	16842	15489	14950	15104	n	13129	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1835	1337	1122	691	449	427		416			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1495	1504	1575	970	636	492		627			
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	311	459	408	348	167	223		376			

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	16,028	2,973	18.38%	47.70%	18.55%
B Grade 4	16,777	2,464	15.62%	47.70%	14.69%
C Grade 5	16,842	2,342	14.28%	47.70%	13.91%
D Grade 6	15,488	2,225	14.06%	47.70%	14.37%
E Grade 7	14,949	1,982	12.60%	47.70%	13.26%
F Grade 8	15,107	1,535	10.29%	47.70%	10.16%
G HS	13,334	1,784	13.07%	48.40%	13.38%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	16,031	3,641	22.04%	47.60%	22.71%
B Grade 4	16,772	3,300	20.38%	47.60%	19.68%
C Grade 5	16,842	3,105	18.93%	47.60%	18.44%
D Grade 6	15,489	2,009	11.36%	47.60%	12.97%
E Grade 7	14,950	1,252	8.68%	47.60%	8.37%
F Grade 8	15,104	1,142	7.37%	47.60%	7.56%
G HS	13,129	1,419	10.95%	45.70%	10.81%

Reasons for Group E Slippage

North Carolina did not meet its target for Group E Grade 7 Math Assessment and had slippage of 0.31 percentage point. For a small percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1%. In 2016-17 the number of students with disabilities in 7th grade who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned decreased by 3.14% (484 students) and the number of students with disabilities who scored at or above proficient decreased by 6.57% (88 students). Although the data for this indicator are based on achievement standards for levels 4 and 5 which are college and career ready proficiency, it's important to identify the data for level 3 that are students who performed at NC's grade level proficiency. In addition to the 8.37% students with disabilities in 7th grade who scored at levels 4 and 5/college and career ready proficiency, an additional 4.35% (651) scored at level 3/grade level proficiency. Historically, the grade 7 math assessment rate has been one of North Carolina's lowest levels of proficiency for students with disabilities. The increased rigor in academic achievement standards has had more of an impact in math on students with disabilities who were on the cusp of cut scores and academic achievement standards. EC Division staff will work NCDPI math curriculum coordinators to review the data and determine other root causes/factors that contributed to the slippage in order to identify appropriate strategies for implementation/improvement.

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 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations click on the xlsx file for 2016-2017 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 2016-17 to view and/or download the report, that includes two documents. One document provides a description of files and codes used. The other document contains the data for each LEA, school, and the State. 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. In order to download and/or open the zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary, a different web browser may be used, or the web link may need to be copied and pasted into the browser.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

FFY 2016 Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs at Level 3/ Grade Level Proficiency	FFY 2013 Data for Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency
A Grade 3	16028	1074	6.70%
B Grade 4	16777	1362	8.12%
C Grade 5	16842	1311	7.78%
D Grade 6	15488	1107	7.15%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

E	14949	843	5.64%
Grade 7			
F	15107	895	5.92%
Grade 8			
G	13334	863	6.47%
HS			

FFY 2016 Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs at Level 3/ Grade Level Proficiency	FFY 2013 Data for Level 3/Grade Level Proficiency
A	16031	1495	9.33%
Grade 3			
B	16772	990	5.90%
Grade 4			
C	16842	909	5.40%
Grade 5			
D	15489	*	< 5%
Grade 6			
E	14950	*	< 5%
Grade 7			
F	15104	*	< 5%
Grade 8			
G	13129	1005	7.65%
HS			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

During the FFY 2015 clarification period, North Carolina's APR was updated to include the correct web links that demonstrate the State has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), as follows:

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 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations click on the xlsx file for 2015-2016 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, that includes two documents. One document provides a description of files and codes used. The other document contains the data for each LEA, school, and the State. 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. In order to download and/or open the zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary, a different web browser may be used, or the web link may need to be copied and pasted into the browser.

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	2.50%
Data	0.40%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	275	0.40%	2.50%	0%

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 cell size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled, but a minimum "n" size is not used. Raw data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum cell size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum cell 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 for each LEA, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts excluded from numerator of the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, **not including correction of findings**

Although suspension and expulsion rates are computed for LEAs with a minimum cell size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled, a minimum "n" size is not used, and raw data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum cell size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum cell 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 for each LEA, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator. Therefore, no LEAs are excluded from the numerator because they did not meet a minimum "n" size.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No LEA had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; therefore no LEA had to review its policies, procedures or practices that contributed to a significant discrepancy and didn't comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. However, if an LEA had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, with its LEA Self-Assessment submitted to the NCDPI's EC Division in May 2017, the LEA would have been required to submit 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. If such a review were submitted with an LEA's annual LEA Self-Assessment update, EC Division staff would review the documentation and make a determination about whether: 1) the policies, procedures and practices were compliant; and 2) if revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements were required. When an LEA is required to revise its policies, procedures, and practices, the NCDPI -EC Division also requires the LEA to report the revisions publicly.

- 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:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	275	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 cell size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled, and a minimum "n" size is not used. Data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum cell size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum cell 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 for each LEA, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts excluded from numerator of the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will 5/29/2018

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, **not including correction of findings**

Although suspension and expulsion rates are computed for LEAs with a minimum cell size of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled, a minimum "n" size is not used, and raw data are reviewed separately for LEAs with less than the minimum cell size to determine if a significant discrepancy exists. If determined that a significant discrepancy exists for an LEA with less than the minimum cell 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 for each LEA, all LEAs are included in the calculation's denominator and no LEAs are excluded from the numerator because they did not meet a minimum "n" size.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No LEA had 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; therefore no LEA had to review its policies, procedures or practices that contributed to a significant discrepancy and didn't comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. However, if an LEA had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, with its LEA Self-Assessment submitted to the NCDPI's EC Division in May 2017, the LEA would have been required to submit 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. If such a review were submitted with an LEA's annual LEA Self-Assessment update, EC Division staff would review the documentation and make a determination about whether: 1) the policies, procedures and practices were compliant; and 2) if revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements were required. When an LEA is required to revise its policies, procedures, and practices, the NCDPI -EC Division also requires the LEA to report the revisions publicly.

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:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	65.40%
	Data	66.78%
B	Target ≤	15.20%
	Data	13.87%
C	Target ≤	2.00%
	Data	1.89%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	180,301	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	120,438	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	25,198	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,839	null

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	336	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1,123	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	120,438	180,301	66.78%	65.30%	66.80%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	25,198	180,301	13.87%	15.20%	13.98%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,298	180,301	1.89%	2.00%	1.83%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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 with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	37.00%
	Data	36.91%
B	Target ≤	21.30%
	Data	21.64%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	19,211	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	6,890	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,949	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	208	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	17	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
---	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,890	19,211	36.91%	37.30%	35.86%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,174	19,211	21.64%	20.00%	21.73%

Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for A Slippage

North Carolina's rate the 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 slipped by 1.05 percentage points in FFY 2016. LEAs are struggling to create new preschool classes due to factors such as limitations on space and constraints around childcare licensing, which necessitate additional fiscal investments to upgrade existing classroom spaces to meet the licensure building codes. Additional challenges include the legislative change in requirements for eligibility in the state's NC Pre-K program for four-year olds, whereby eligibility for inclusion into that program is more dependent upon family income level than need based on disability. The state does not provide funding for the regular education component of a program for a child who is three through five years of age and has a disability. Program administrators first attempt to make sure these children apply for regular education funding through the Title I Preschool and Head Start programs, as well as the state's NC Pre-K program. Funding for the regular education component of a program for 3-year-olds is more problematic than for 4-year-olds with a disability.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The NC Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) provided districts with professional development and technical assistance via webinars addressing Indicator 6 data to help districts understand and use the data for program planning (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/node/2109>). Preschool LRE data were disaggregated by age groups, since the challenges of providing inclusive opportunities for preschool aged children are greater than for kindergarten children. Individual LEA data displays were also provided (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/state-data>) so that district coordinators could present their data to their local leadership teams during program improvement discussions.

During the February 2017 Preschool LRE data webinar, the newly released OSEP Dear Colleague Letter on Preschool Educational Environments (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nceln.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/MemoEarlyChildhoodLREOSEPLetter0217.pdf>) was highlighted and the data in Table 2 were discussed. The calculations for summary statements A and B were applied to the four age bands. These data indicate a significant number of placements in the most restrictive settings for three-year olds, as compared to the other age bands. Guidance from the Dear Colleague Letter on making LRE decisions was discussed. Possible options for developing inclusive classroom opportunities for 3-year-olds included increased collaboration with Head Start and fee for service programs for typically developing peers that do not qualify for funding from state and federal at-risk programs.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	82.50%
	Data	85.34%
A2	Target ≥	35.20%
	Data	34.53%
B1	Target ≥	82.52%
	Data	82.67%
B2	Target ≥	34.46%
	Data	33.38%
C1	Target ≥	82.00%
	Data	82.94%
C2	Target ≥	52.17%
	Data	50.98%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	6242.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	47.00	0.75%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	822.00	13.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3205.00	51.35%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1663.00	26.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	505.00	8.09%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	4868.00	5737.00	85.34%	82.50%	84.85%
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)	2168.00	6242.00	34.53%	35.20%	34.73%

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	44.00	0.70%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	960.00	15.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3107.00	49.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1781.00	28.53%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	350.00	5.61%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	4888.00	5892.00	82.67%	82.52%	82.96%
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)	2131.00	6242.00	33.38%	34.46%	34.14%

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	0.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	777.00	12.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2250.00	36.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2099.00	33.63%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1065.00	17.06%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	4349.00	5177.00	82.94%	82.00%	84.01%
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)	3164.00	6242.00	50.98%	52.17%	50.69%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

LEAs used the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) to collect "entry" and "exit" data regarding outcomes for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs. An NCDPI memorandum was issued May 10, 2017 to LEAs regarding the data submission due dates for certain Indicators, including Indicator 7 (August 15, 2017) and how to access the Indicator 7 spreadsheet for data submission. LEAs then submitted data for Indicator 7 through NCDPI's Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS). The Indicator 7 spreadsheet for submitting the data was posted to the CECAS communication site on the Reporting Users tab <http://www.nccecas.org/reportinguser/reportinguser.html>. The Indicator & Spreadsheet includes an algorithm to ensure that only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years be included in the measurement. The Indicator 7 spreadsheet has also been updated with columns to notify LEAs if students have gained or lost more than three points progress. This is only a validation warning, so that LEAs can verify that the data is correct.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state maintains a state and local data dashboard to provide LEA leaders with data displays and guidance documents on "Understanding Your LEA Data" (see NC data dashboard at <http://ncln.fpg.unc.edu/north-carolina-state-data-child-outcomes>).

North Carolina continues to provide professional development to LEA administrators, especially to 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.ncln.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.ncln.fpg.unc.edu/foundations/module-intro> and 3) Developing High Quality Functional IEPs for PreK <http://modules.ncln.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.

In December, 2017, the State released the North Carolina Learning and Development Progressions <http://ncln.fpg.unc.edu/node/2772>. In order for teachers to do valid and reliable child outcome ratings, they must have an understanding of the progression of child development. These Progressions are an expansion of the North Carolina Foundations for Early Learning and Development (2013). The Progressions break down the sequence in which children learn skills for emotional and social, health and physical, language and communication, and cognitive development. Skill descriptions at two, three, or six-month intervals allow teachers and families to observe and document a child's current level of development and to track incremental changes over time. Observation guidelines provide situations for observation of skills, strategies for eliciting the skill, if needed, what observed behavior indicates achievement of the skill, and routines-based intervention or embedded instruction.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	50.00%
Data	46.22%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
753.00	1734.00	46.22%	50.00%	43.43%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	9.97%	17392.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Reasons for Slippage

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) did not meet its target of 50% and had slippage of 2.79 percentage points. A total of 17,392 surveys (3,695 - preschool; 13,697 school-aged) were sent to parents in forty-three (43) LEAs and 1,734 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 9.97%. This was a decrease in the number (367) of surveys completed and returned from the previous year. This represents the lowest response rate experienced and matches the low FFY 2014 response rate when there were issues with distribution of surveys. The FFY 2014 rate (43.83%) for the number of respondent parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was also similar to the FFY 2016 rate (43.43%). In FFY 2016, the NCDPI moved the timeline for distribution to earlier in Spring 2016 to facilitate conflicts with other events near the end of the school year. After distributing the surveys, it was determined that the deadline for returning surveys conflicted with most LEAs spring break. To address this concern, after the fact the timeline for the return of surveys was extended; however the extension only facilitated the receipt of a small number of additional surveys. The slippage in the rate of parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities is at least partially a result of the low response rate. During the next year, with input from stakeholders, the NCDPI is reviewing its process for collecting the data to determine if revisions are needed in order to improve the response rate and the overall data.

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Strategies the NCDPI will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics, include:

- 1) continuing to oversample for parents of students that were under-represented in the response data, including parents of students with specific learning disabilities, speech-language impairments, and other disabilities and parents of students who are African American.
- 2) reviewing the timeline for disseminating the surveys to ensure an optimal response rate.
- 3) with input from stakeholders, completing its review of the process for collecting the data to determine if revisions are needed in order to improve the response rate, its representativeness, and the overall data. Items currently being considered include streamlining the survey (input from participants indicate the survey is too long) and including the survey in the Every Child's Accountability & Tracking System (ECATS) so the NCDPI can work directly with LEAs to collect the data rather than contracting with a vendor to do so.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

A total of 17,392 surveys (school-age and preschool) were shipped to forty-three (43) LEAs sampled across the state of North Carolina. A total of 1,734 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 9.97%. This was a decrease of 2.26 percentage points 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 groups did not match the representative sample surveyed. To offset the underrepresentation in the response group, the NCDPI oversampled in the survey distribution. Although, the oversampling would normally impact the response rates of under-represented groups, as identified below, the overall response rate was impacted by issues identified in the reasons for slippage section.

a) The FFY 2016 data suggest that African-American students were under-represented (25.0%) while white students were over-represented (56.0%) and other races were slightly over-represented (19%) 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	25.0%	56.0%	19.0%

b) In FFY 2016, preschool children were slightly over-represented (23.0%), while students in grades K-12 were slightly under-represented (77.0%) as compared to surveys distributed. This gap decreased from previous years.

Distribution by Grade		
Surveys	Preschool	School-Age
Distributed	21.0%	79.0%
Returned	23.0%	77.0%

c) In FFY 2016, students with autism (14.0%) and developmental delays (16.0%) were over-represented while students with specific learning disabilities (24.0%), speech-language impairments (18.0%), and other disability categories (2.1%) were under-represented and students with intellectual disabilities (7.4%) 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	14.0%	16.0%	7.4%	14.0%	24.0%	18.0%	2.1%	0.0%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 2

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 that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
23	0	285	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, by annually 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-three (23) LEAs had disproportionate representation in 2016-17, which is determined by a risk ratio of $\geq 3.0^*$.

The NCDPI completed steps 2 and 3 for the 23 LEAs identified with disproportionate representation. Steps 2 and 3 are described in the section: Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

* Risk ratios are computed for LEAs with a minimum of 30 students of the particular race/ethnicity identified in special education and related services.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation the State identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, the NCDPI:

2. requires LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to include in its annual LEA Self-Assessment update an updated description of an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d); and

3. reviews the results of the updated description of an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d) included in the the LEA Self-Assessment along with other factors such as trend data and student

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

record reviews, available through on-site Program Compliance Reviews or otherwise determined necessary, to make a determination about whether or not the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification.

Using these steps to examine the data and information for each of the twenty-three (23) LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, zero (0) LEAs in 2016-17, or 0% had disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was a result of inappropriate identification. The twenty-three (23) LEAs including twenty (20) public charter schools and three (3) traditional LEAs, that are small in size, have been identified with disproportionate representation for the first time. In a review of records for the public charter schools, the majority of students had been identified in another LEA prior to enrolling in the charter school.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts excluded from numerator of the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, not including correction of findings

North Carolina reported that two (2) districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 2

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 that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
38	0	285	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

In North Carolina, disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is defined as a risk ratio of ≥ 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 specific disability categories annually, 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;

Thirty-eight (38) LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in 2016-17 which is determined by a risk ratio of $\geq 3.0^*$ of a racial/ethnic group in a specific disability category. For the districts identified with disproportionate representation, the NCDPI completed steps 2 and 3. Steps 2 and 3 are described in the section: Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

* Risk ratios are computed for LEAs with a minimum of 30 students of the particular race/ethnicity identified in the disability category.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

To determine whether the disproportionate overrepresentation the State identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, the NCDPI:

2. requires LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, to include in its annual LEA Self-Assessment update an updated description of an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d); and

3. reviews the results of the updated description of an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d) included in the the LEA Self-Assessment along with other factors such as trend data and student record reviews, available through on-site Program Compliance Reviews or otherwise determined necessary, to make a determination about whether or not the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification.

Using these steps to examine the data and information for each of the thirty-eight (38) LEAs with disproportionate representation, zero (0) LEAs in 2016-17, or 0% had disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was a result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, twenty-eight (28) of the thirty-eight (38) LEAs including two (2) public charter schools and twenty-six (26) traditional LEAs, that are mostly small in size, have been identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability category for the first time. The ten (10) LEAs that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability category the previous year have made progress in reducing their risk ratio in the given racial and ethnic group and specific disability category.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts excluded from numerator of the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, **not including correction of findings**

North Carolina reported that two (2) districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State established minimum "n" size requirement.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	91.55%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
42,031	38,660	91.55%	100%	91.98%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	3,371
---	-------

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 - 614
6-15 days - 674
16-25 days - 436
26-35 days - 320
36-45 days - 235
46 days or more - 1092
Total - 3,371
Reasons for delays/referrals that went beyond the 90 day timeline -
Referral paperwork not processed in a timely manner - 1885
Excessive student absences - 96
Weather delays - 138
Delay in getting parent consent for evaluation - 309
Other - 943
Total - 3,371
5/29/2018

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- 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 2016-17 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
146	142	0	4

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The 146 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 146 LEAs with findings of non-compliance, the EC Division has verified that 142 LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The 146 LEAs with non-compliant findings had 3,577 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2015-16. 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 2,321 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 1,256 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 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Although all child-specific findings of non-compliance were corrected, following the review of new data/student records, four (4) LEAs exhibited continued low compliance rates and the EC Division could not verify within one year or subsequently that the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory timelines. As a result, the NCDPI is requiring the LEAs to take the following steps to correct the non-compliance and ensure the regulatory timelines are correctly implemented:

- 1) within 30 days of notification that the LEA did not correct or subsequently correct the non-compliant finding, the LEA is required to submit to NCDPI the root cause(s) for failure to meet the 90-day referral to placement timeline (root causes must further clarify the reasons for delay provided in the original submission of data);
- 2) within 30 days of notification that the LEA did not correct or subsequently correct the non-compliant finding, the LEA is required to submit to the NCDPI information documenting revisions to systems for monitoring the referral process and timelines that address the root cause(s) for failure to meet the 90-day timeline and any revisions to policies, procedures, and/or other practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and
- 3) within 90 days of notification that the LEA did not correct or subsequently correct the non-compliant finding, the LEA is required to submit to the NCDPI new data/student records to ensure the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. NCDPI staff will review the data/records submitted to verify compliance. In the event compliance is not achieved, the NCDPI will identify additional corrective and/or enforcement action(s) to be issued.

FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.74%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	6,635
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	729
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,046
d. Number of children 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.	2,609
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	140
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	3,046	3,157	97.74%	100%	96.48%

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, or f	111
--	-----

Reasons for Slippage

North Carolina's rate for early childhood transition slipped 1.26 percentage points in FFY 2016 to 96.48%. The total number of children transitioning from the Part C system (6635) remained stable from FFY 2015 (6639). Ninety-eight (98) of 115 LEAs (85.22%) demonstrated 100% compliance for FFY 2016. Of the ninety-eight (98) compliant LEAs, 11 raised their performance from non-compliant to compliant. Of the seventeen (17) non-compliant LEAs, nine (9) demonstrated compliance between 90.9% and 99.9% and eight (8) demonstrated compliance of < 90%.

LEAs continued to report that limited staffing for evaluation teams impedes their ability to reschedule missed appointments for the entry evaluations and initial IEP meetings when a family issue or child issue, such as illness, causes the family to miss a scheduled appointment. However, the primary cause for the slippage resulted from one LEA having an increase of almost 100 children transitioning from Part C and a corresponding drop in of 16.28% in their data. The state initiated individual technical assistance and support to assist this LEA to build more capacity for entry level assessments.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. 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 -

- 1 to 5 days - 18
- 6 to 15 days - 34
- 16 to 25 days - 15

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

26 to 35 days - 9

36 to 45 days - 7

46 days or more - 28

Total - 111

Total number of students delayed due to the following reasons -

a. Family Circumstance (e.g. illness/death in family, change in custody, etc.) - 29

b. Child Circumstance (e.g., child was sick) - 11

c. Part B Circumstance (delays related to completion of evaluations, holding timely meeting, arranging transportation, school enrollment paperwork, etc.) - 70

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) - 1

Total - 111

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. The Part C system begins notifying Part B of children starting at 2 years, 3 months of age. The transition process is outlined in a Guiding Practices Document and local interagency plans; and additional technical assistance is provided by numerous supporting documents (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/node/315>).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The NC Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) provides technical assistance and professional development on transition via a new preschool coordinator's orientation process (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/events/2016-new-ec-preschool-coordinators-orientation>), regional coordinator's meetings (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/node/2386>), and individual LEA data displays via a data dashboard (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/north-carolina-state-data-transition>).

The NCDPI began participating in a data sharing cohort with the Part C agency in 2015, facilitated by the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy). The project is now completing an amendment to the existing Interagency Agreement, with a chart that outlines the data sharing process. In addition, the Part B system is now implementing a new data system (July 2018 start date) in which individual child transition notifications will be entered at the state level. The goal is to ease the burden placed on the local Part C and B agencies and ensure reliable and valid child notification data.

During FFY 2016, NCDPI staff met with the Part C leadership (including the Directors of the Part C local agencies) to discuss the need to revise and amend local interagency agreements called the "Catchment Area Transition Plans." In a few cases, the NCDPI assisted with the development of new plans; although all are not updated. They are posted here: <http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/catchment-plans>.

The NCDPI continues to provide professional development for LEA early childhood diagnostic teams on developmentally and culturally appropriate diagnostic practices for comprehensive evaluations, evaluations specific to early childhood autism, and in conducting early childhood vision screening. An established Preschool Assessment Demonstration Team program provides technical assistance and opportunities to observe best practices in diagnostics. The professional development and demonstration project is facilitated through the 619-funded professional development and technical assistance system, the NC Early Learning Network (<http://nceln.fpg.unc.edu/>). The NCDPI contracts with NC Prevent Blindness for vision screening training and the TEAACH program at UNC-Chapel Hill for training in assessment of autism.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

5/29/2018

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016, and 3) new Indicator 12 data for the first quarter of 2017. 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 seventy (70) child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2015-16. 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 fifty-eight (58) child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. Seven (7) 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 twelve (12) 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 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	88.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
734	860	88.14%	100%	85.35%

Reasons for Slippage

North Carolina did not meet the target of 100%, and the FFY 2016 rate represented slippage of 2.79 percentage points from the previous year. Data for this indicator are collected through monitoring. The NCDPI increased the cell size for masking data in public reports from < 5 to < 10. As a result, the EC Division increased the number of records it reviews when monitoring to ensure, when possible, enough records have been included in order to report the data publicly. In FFY 2016, 860 records were reviewed to determine compliance with secondary transition components in the IEP. 489 more records were reviewed for secondary transition than in FFY 2015 (371 records reviewed). Additionally, the NCDPI conducted on-site Program Reviews in forty-four (44) LEAs as compared to thirty-three (33) LEAs the previous year. Reviewing more than twice as many records for secondary transition in had an impact on the number of compliant IEPs. LEAs were in compliance with all required components related to secondary transition except for post-secondary goals. In the 126 student-specific findings, the goals developed were not clear that they were post-secondary goals rather than secondary goals.

In addition to technical assistance and/or professional development provided specifically to address the concern about post-secondary goals, NCDPI staff have provided training through a training of trainers in each of the State's eight regions on its transition toolkit (an electronic live binder) which can be found at <http://www.livebinders.com/play/play?id=1996892>. Training includes access to secondary transition resources that focus on IEP and post-secondary goals. All LEAs had the opportunity to send a representative to participate in training to become a trainer in the use of the toolkit. Trainers are expected to train staff within their districts. Because of staff turnover in LEAs, additional trainings are being provided throughout the year. The EC Division is also evaluating the use of the toolkit and its impact on transition outcomes and to make any needed revisions to the toolkit and/or training.

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 2016-17 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in forty-four (44) LEAs, including thirty-seven (37) traditional LEAs, six (6) charter schools, and one (1) State-Operated Program (SOP) 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).

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Nineteen (19) of the thirty-three (33) 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 nineteen (19) 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

Nineteen (19) of thirty-three (33) 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 (44 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). NCDPI verified the correction of the 44 IEPs that had non-compliant findings related to the transition requirements.

**FFY 2016 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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	39.50%
	Data	38.39%
B	Target ≥	62.50%
	Data	71.73%
C	Target ≥	73.50%
	Data	77.98%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 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	979.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	267.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	345.00
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)	60.00
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).	93.00

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	267.00	979.00	38.39%	39.50%	27.27%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	612.00	979.00	71.73%	62.50%	62.51%
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)	765.00	979.00	77.98%	73.50%	78.14%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Reasons for A Slippage

North Carolina's FFY 2016 rate for A. Enrolled in higher education was 27.27%. The 27.27% rate represents 267 of 979 respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. The State did not meet its target of 39.50% and had slippage of 11.12 percentage points.

The State changed its data collection process for FFY 2016 to address concerns about low response rates, including low response rates from students who had dropped out and provide LEAs with better, more useful data. The State no longer contracted with an outside agency to conduct the survey interviews/collect and analyze the data. For the first time each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, conducted the survey interviews/collected and submitted its data to the NCDPI-EC Division. As a result, the number of responses to the survey increased significantly, from 336 responses in FFY 2015 to 979 responses in FFY 2016. Because of low response rates in previous years, the rate of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school may have been inflated. Also, according to data from North Carolina's Institutes of Higher Education an increased number of first time students are not entering higher education directly from high school. An increased number of students are entering after having tried a course at a Community College or engaged in a work experience. One four-year university indicated this was true for 47% of its Fall enrollees. Additionally, common anecdotal comments in the FFY 2016 survey data collected identified a concern of the cost of attending college - 2 or 4-year programs, lack of funds to do so, and needing to work first to save money for costs associated with attending school.

Was a survey used? Yes
 Is it a new or revised survey? No

Was sampling used? Yes
 Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

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 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 all students with IEPs who graduated with a regular diploma, aged out, received a certificate, dropped out, or were expected to return but did not.

A total of 2,144 Exitors were included in the 2017 follow-up survey of the 2015-16 school Exitors. A total of 979 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 45.66%, representing a rate increase of more than 30 percentage points from the previous year.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

To examine potential nonresponse bias, a comparison of the known characteristics of all 2015-16 Exitors to the characteristics of those who completed the survey was conducted and noted in the following table.

Percentages of Total School Exitors, Survey Completers, and Differences between Percentages

School Leaver Characteristics	Total school Exitors (%)	Completed survey (%)	Difference* (percentage points)
<i>Gender</i>			
Female	32	34	+2
Male	68	66	-2
<i>Race</i>			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

African American	37	34	-3
Hispanic	11	10	-1
White	47	50	+3
Other Races	5	6	+1
<i>Disability</i>			
Autism	7	8	+1
Intellectual Disability	14	16	+2
Other Health Impaired	24	22	-2
Serious Emotional Disability	5	3	-2
Specific Learning Disability	48	46	-2
Other Disabilities	3	5	+2
<i>Type of exit</i>			
Graduated	73	83.8	+10.8
Certificate	6	5	-1
Dropped Out	20	10.2	-9.8
Reached Maximum Age	1	1	0

*Difference between the percentage of school Exiters and the percentage of Exiters in the sample who completed the survey. The acceptable range of over/under-representation is typically +/-3 percentage points. Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The response rate was representative about gender, race, and disability categories. The sample of Exiters who completed the survey is over-represented by those who graduated and under-represented by those who dropped out. Students who had dropped out represented approximately 20% of the students in the sample, and only 10.2% of the respondents. This potential nonresponse bias, regarding those who graduated and those who dropped out, is similar to previous years' discrepancies between the population and sample.

The State changed its data collection process for FFY 2016 to address concerns about low response rates and the under-representation of drop-outs in the response rate to provide LEAs with better, more useful data. The State no longer contracted with an outside agency to conduct the survey interviews/collect and analyze the data. For the first time each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, conducted the survey interviews/collected and submitted its data to the NCDPI-EC Division. As a result, the number of responses to the survey increased significantly, from 336 responses in FFY 2015 to 979 responses in FFY 2016 for a response rate of 45.66%. This represents a response rate increase of more than 30 percentage points. LEAs attempted to contact all students in the sample and when telephone numbers and/or email addresses didn't work, they employed methods such as finding students through social media, relatives and friends. Even with these methods, LEAs were unable to contact some former students. Also, some former students who the LEAs were able to contact chose not to participate in the survey.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2016 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

North Carolina's response rate was representative about gender, race, and disability categories. The sample of Exitters who completed the survey was over-represented by those who graduated and under-represented by those who dropped out. Students who dropped out represented approximately 20% of the students in the sample, and those who dropped out represented only 10.2% of the respondents. A comparison of the known characteristics of all 2015-16 Exitters to the characteristics of those who completed the survey was conducted and noted in the following table.

Percentages of Total School Exitters, Survey Completers, and Differences between Percentages

School Leaver Characteristics	Total school Exitters(%)	Completed survey (%)	Difference* (percentage points)
Gender			
Female	32%	34%	+2
Male	68%	66%	-2
Race			
African American	37%	34%	-3
Hispanic	11%	10%	-1
White	47%	50%	+3
Other Races	5%	6%	+1
Disability			
Autism	7%	8%	+1
Intellectual Disability	14%	16%	+2
Other Health Impaired	24%	22%	-2
Serious Emotional Disability	5%	3%	-2
Specific Learning Disability	48%	46%	-2
Other Disabilities	3%	5%	+2
Type of Exit			
Graduated	73%	83.8%	+10.8
Certificate	6%	5%	-1

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Dropped Out	20%	10.2%	-9.8
Reached Maximum Age	1%	1%	0

*Difference between the percentage of school Exiters and the percentage of Exiters in the sample who completed the survey. The acceptable range of over/under-representation is typically +/-3 percentage points. Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The State changed its data collection process for FFY 2016 to address concerns about low response rates and the under-representation of drop-outs in the response rate to provide LEAs with better, more useful data. The State no longer contracted with an outside agency to conduct the survey interviews/collect and analyze the data. For the first time each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, conducted the survey interviews/collected and submitted its data to the NCDPI-ECD. As a result, the number of responses to the survey increased significantly, from 336 responses in FFY 2015 to 979 responses in FFY 2016 for a response rate of 46.55%, representing a response rate increase of more than 30 percentage points. LEAs attempted to contact all students in the sample and when telephone numbers and/or email addresses didn't work, they employed methods such as finding students through social media, relatives and friends. Even with these methods, LEAs were unable to contact some former students. Also, some former students who the LEAs were able to contact chose not to participate in the survey.

**FFY 2016 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		
Target	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%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	50.00%			16.67%			48.84%		

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	10	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	26	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
10	26	48.84%	75.00% - 85.00%	38.46%

Reasons for Slippage

Data indicated that the number of resolution sessions decreased substantially in 2016-17 and fewer resolution sessions were resolved through settlement agreements. Feedback from participants involved in resolution sessions, as well as other anecdotal information gathered during various stakeholder meetings throughout the year, indicated that in several instances there was a lack of interest to resolve disagreements during resolution sessions, and the intent was only to complete the process in order to go to due process hearings and/or collect attorney fees. The NCDPI-EC Division 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 continued and increased use of early resolution processes.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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		
Target	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%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%
Data	77.27%			65.71%			61.54%		

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	15	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	15	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	38	null

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
15	15	38	61.54%	75.00% - 85.00%	78.95%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The NCDPI-EC Divisions 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 continued and increased use of early resolution processes.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≥				
Data				

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	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 2016 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.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See attachment - NC SSIP Phase Three, Year Two

**FFY 2016 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: Nancy T. Johnson

Title: State Performance Plan Coordinator

Email: ntjohnso@uncc.edu

Phone: 704-576-2760