

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**

North Carolina



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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, including FFY 2019 targets, at the Council's quarterly meeting on December 11, 2019. Council members were also provided the opportunity to provide additional input by email for consideration any time prior to the submission of the APR and/or the clarification period. EC Division staff also shared data and information, reviewed progress made, and solicited members' input toward the development of the APR, including FFY 2019 targets, at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) external stakeholder meetings on December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. In addition to discussions/input shared at the meetings, members were provided the opportunity to provide additional input by email for consideration any time prior to submission of the APR and/or the clarification period.

By June 1, 2019, the NCDPI-ECD reported to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR was 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 reports were posted on the Department's website, sent to the LEAs, and distributed to local and regional media. The APR and LEA public reports were posted at https://ec.ncpublicschools.gov/ecats/lea-apr/lea-apr-2018/copy9_of_APR2017BNC.pdf. This same process will be implemented by June 1, 2020 for posting and distributing the FFY 2018 APR and the LEA performance reports.

The FFY 2018 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 for Indicators 8 and 14. North Carolina distributed surveys through local education agencies involved in the Indicator 8 sample and for the first time collected and analyzed parent involvement data for Indicator 8, rather than contracting with a 3rd party vendor. Each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, collected and submitted its data electronically to the NCDPI-ECD. As a result, in FFY 2018, Indicator 14 maintained an acceptable response rate of 35%.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

312

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 North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Exceptional Children Division General Supervision Position Paper.

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 organized its infrastructure to provide 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, monthly EC Directors' webinars or on-site at 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 universal, tailored, and 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 each tier of support. 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. 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.

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

Stakeholder Involvement

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

By June 1, 2019, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), Exceptional Children Division reported to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets of its Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was posted on the NCDPI web page and distributed to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). In addition, it was made available to the media. The Exceptional Children Division also reported on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the APR by June 1, 2019. The reports were posted on the Department's website, and a link to the reports was provided to the LEAs, and distributed to local and regional media.

The APR and LEA public reports were posted at <https://ec.ncpublicschools.gov/ecats/lea-apr/lea-apr-2018>.

Copy and paste the website link into your browser. Once you go to the link, to view the APR, at the top of the page click on the APR-2017B-NC and its accompanying attachments. To view the LEA public reports, click on each LEA's report listed on the page.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, including for Indicator B-17/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/SSIP, and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	49.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	62.30%	64.40%	67.30%	68.90%	70.32%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

North Carolina's current and FFY 2019 proposed targets (80%) are greater than the 2019 target (76.7%) for students with disabilities in the State's ESSA Plan. In consideration of recommendations from stakeholders, a decision was made to maintain the higher targets until which time (2021-22) the ESSA target meets/exceeds the APR targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	10,234
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	14,818
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.06%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,234	14,818	70.32%	80.00%	69.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

North Carolina's 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities slipped by 1.26 percentage points from the previous year. An additional 2,589 students with disabilities, or an increase of 21.17%, were in the 4-year adjusted cohort and an additional 1,639 students with disabilities, or an increase of 19% graduated with a standard high school diploma. For the first time, students identified as students with disabilities at any time during their designated 4-year graduation cohort, including those who had exited special education, were counted in the 4-year adjusted cohort's students with disabilities subgroup, which largely accounted for the additional 2,589 students. A year to year comparison of students with disabilities that were still receiving special education services and exited special education by earning high school diplomas remained fairly constant in the last few years, including 2016 -17 (8,852) and 2017-18 (8,893). The difference in the additional number of students in 4-year adjusted cohort and the number of those students that graduated within four years largely accounted for the slippage. The 5-year adjusted cohort rate for students with disabilities entering 9th grade in 2014-15 for the first time was 72.5%. Additionally, 69.8% of the 15,364 entering 9th graders with disabilities in 2015-16 graduated in 2018-19 or before which was an increase of nearly a percentage point.

Graduation Conditions
Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years
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 2017-18 or earlier, to all youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2014-15 for the first time.
Youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2014-15 and graduating with a regular diploma in 2017-18 or earlier ÷ All youths with IEPs entering ninth grade in 2014-15 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.

To graduate from high school/earn a standard high school diploma, students in North Carolina must earn at least 22 credits in the Future-Ready Course of Study or in the Occupational Course of Study. Although the state requires a designated number of courses and credits for students to graduate high school, local school districts and other public school units may require additional courses and credits to graduate. Students in the Future-Ready Course of Study must earn their 22 credits as follows: four sequential English credits, four mathematics credits, three science credits, four social studies credits, one health and physical education credit which includes successful completion of CPR instruction, and six elective credits. Students in the Occupational Course of Study must earn their 22 credits as follows: four sequential English credits, three mathematics credits, two science credits, two social studies credits, one health and physical education credit which includes successful completion of CPR instruction, six occupational preparation education credits, and four career/technical education elective credits.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The EC Division will be providing LEAs with data profiles that will include three to four years of trend data for graduation rates, dropout rates, math and reading proficiency rates, and disciplinary disproportionality, as well as other data. The data profiles will be shared with the LEAs at Regional meetings, to be held in the Spring. The purpose of the data profiles is to assist LEAs with root cause analyses and identification of evidence-based practices to improve results for submission as part of each LEA's annual Self-Assessment.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR
1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use 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.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	9.21%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	4.70%	4.50%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%
Data	3.36%	3.77%	4.65%	4.07%	3.95%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,893
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	617
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	85
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	2,214
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	44

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

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, using 2017-18 lag data, is:

Rate = $100 * \text{Numerator} \div (\text{Denominator} + \text{Numerator})$ $100 * 2,214 \div (52,862 + 2,214) = 4.02\%$ or $100 * 2,214 \div 55,076 = 4.02\%$

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

Denominator: 2017 FirstMonth20DayMembership for youth with IEPs + Numerator

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,214	55,076	3.95%	3.00%	4.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	HS								X	X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	99.60%	Actual	99.66%	99.78%	99.66%	99.59%	99.63%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	99.60%	Actual	99.59%	99.80%	99.69%	99.64%	99.65%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

C	Grade 5	99.60%	Actual	99.69%	99.77%	99.72%	99.65%	99.66%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	99.30%	Actual	99.36%	99.41%	99.28%	99.31%	99.29%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	99.10%	Actual	99.17%	99.41%	99.22%	99.04%	99.13%
F	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	98.70%	Actual	98.98%	99.03%	99.05%	98.98%	98.82%
G	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	HS	93.00%	Actual	94.96%	96.62%	96.50%	96.83%	97.19%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	99.60%	Actual	99.68%	99.76%	99.67%	99.61%	99.58%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	99.60%	Actual	99.59%	99.76%	99.68%	99.61%	99.62%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	Grade 5	99.60%	Actual	99.69%	99.75%	99.70%	99.65%	99.61%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	99.10%	Actual	99.27%	99.39%	99.23%	99.31%	99.10%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	98.90%	Actual	99.11%	99.34%	99.15%	99.05%	99.01%
F	Grade 8	2005	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	98.60%	Actual	98.95%	98.99%	99.00%	98.95%	98.78%
G	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	HS	95.00%	Actual	94.90%	95.34%	95.92%	96.58%	97.79%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	G >=	HS	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Math	G >=	HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	15,551	16,804	16,814	16,347	16,084	14,907		13,428			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,904	5,228	4,771	4,268	4,145	4,178		3,892			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	9,342	10,228	10,651	10,639	10,454	9,289		8,069			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,245	1,292	1,306	1,311	1,353	1,259		1,037			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	15,550	16,802	16,815	16,347	16,083	14,907			11,143		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,080	4,036	3,784	3,117	3,203	3,498			2,847		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10,160	11,407	11,627	11,763	11,370	9,940			6,901		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,249	1,289	1,300	1,309	1,350	1,253			1,129		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	15,551	15,491	99.63%	95.00%	99.61%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	16,804	16,748	99.65%	95.00%	99.67%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	16,814	16,728	99.66%	95.00%	99.49%	Met Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	16,347	16,218	99.29%	95.00%	99.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	16,084	15,952	99.13%	95.00%	99.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	14,907	14,726	98.82%	95.00%	98.79%	Met Target	No Slippage
G	HS	13,428	12,998	97.19%	95.00%	96.80%	Met Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	HS	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	15,550	15,489	99.58%	95.00%	99.61%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	16,802	16,732	99.62%	95.00%	99.58%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	16,815	16,711	99.61%	95.00%	99.38%	Met Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	16,347	16,189	99.10%	95.00%	99.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	16,083	15,923	99.01%	95.00%	99.01%	Met Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	14,907	14,691	98.78%	95.00%	98.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
G	HS	11,143	10,877	97.79%	95.00%	97.61%	Met Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	HS	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

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: <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/testing-and-school-accountability/school-accountability-and-reporting/accountability-data-sets-and-reports#students-with-disabilities-assessment-participation-with-and-without-accommodations>

Copy and paste the link into your internet browser. When the link is accessed, click on the 2018-19 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations to download the report. When the report is downloaded, click on it to view the report.

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

<https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/testing-and-school-accountability/school-accountability-and-reporting/accountability-data-sets-and-reports#reports-of-supplemental-disaggregated-state,-school-system-and-school-performance-data>

Copy and paste the link into your internet browser. When the link is accessed, scroll down to/click on Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data near the bottom of the page. Click on Disaggregated Performance Data for 2018-19 to download the report. Once the folder/zip file has downloaded, click on it to open the folder, 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 NCEXTEND1, 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 downloaded file folder/zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary or a different web browser may be used.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	HS								X	X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2012	Target ≥	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%
A	Grade 3	17.40%	Actual	18.52%	18.38%	18.38%	18.55%	18.17%
B	Grade 4	2012	Target ≥	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%
B	Grade 4	15.00%	Actual	14.04%	16.46%	15.62%	14.69%	15.91%
C	Grade 5	2012	Target ≥	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%

C	Grade 5	12.70%	Actual	12.48%	13.47%	14.28%	13.91%	13.33%
D	Grade 6	2012	Target >=	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%
D	Grade 6	12.70%	Actual	11.59%	13.17%	14.06%	14.37%	14.48%
E	Grade 7	2012	Target >=	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%
E	Grade 7	13.30%	Actual	12.78%	13.04%	12.60%	13.26%	14.73%
F	Grade 8	2012	Target >=	21.60%	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%
F	Grade 8	10.10%	Actual	9.82%	10.64%	10.29%	10.16%	10.21%
G	HS	2012	Target >=	22.60%	31.20%	39.80%	48.40%	57.00%
G	HS	14.40%	Actual	15.10%	13.53%	13.07%	13.38%	11.99%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
A	Grade 3	16.39%	Actual	19.62%	20.77%	22.04%	22.71%	22.67%
B	Grade 4	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
B	Grade 4	12.08%	Actual	16.90%	19.24%	20.38%	19.68%	19.72%
C	Grade 5	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
C	Grade 5	10.71%	Actual	15.44%	16.79%	18.93%	18.44%	17.82%
D	Grade 6	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
D	Grade 6	8.80%	Actual	9.42%	10.35%	11.36%	12.97%	11.57%
E	Grade 7	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
E	Grade 7	8.50%	Actual	7.48%	8.01%	8.68%	8.37%	9.95%
F	Grade 8	2018	Target >=	21.20%	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%
F	Grade 8	6.01%	Actual	6.35%	7.39%	7.37%	7.56%	7.41%
G	HS	2018	Target >=	18.70%	27.70%	36.70%	45.70%	54.70%
G	HS	12.04%	Actual	9.56%	10.99%	10.95%	10.81%	11.60%
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	56.40%	56.40%
Reading	G >=	HS	57.00%	57.00%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	56.40%	25.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	56.40%	25.50%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	56.40%	25.50%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	56.40%	25.50%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	56.40%	25.50%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	56.40%	25.50%
Math	G >=	HS	54.70%	22.50%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

With the administration of new mathematics assessments in 2018-19, setting the baseline for mathematics in 2018, and with consideration of stakeholder recommendations, the 2019 targets for mathematics grades 3 - 8 and high school were aligned with the targets for students with disabilities in North Carolina's ESSA Plan.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

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	15,491	16,748	16,728	16,218	15,952	14,726		12,998			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,502	1,272	898	869	709	525		562			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	629	809	670	836	788	547		616			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	640	556	729	527	539	527		456			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

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	15,489	16,732	16,711	16,189	15,923	14,691			10,877		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,518	1,110	881	583	538	389			402		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	937	830	808	767	745	407			489		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	84	81	101	74	71	87			419		

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	15,491	2,771	18.17%	56.40%	17.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	16,748	2,637	15.91%	56.40%	15.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	16,728	2,297	13.33%	56.40%	13.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	16,218	2,232	14.48%	56.40%	13.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	15,952	2,036	14.73%	56.40%	12.76%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
F	Grade 8	14,726	1,599	10.21%	56.40%	10.86%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	HS	12,998	1,634	11.99%	57.00%	12.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at the college and career readiness level in grade 7 slipped by 1.97 percentage points. There was a 5.02% increase in the number of students with valid scores, but an 8.82% decrease in the number of students scoring at the college and career readiness (CCR) level. Students who took alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards and scored at the CCR level increased slightly from the previous year. While the number of students with disabilities who took regular assessments with or without accommodations increased, the number of students who scored at the CCR level decreased from the previous year, accounting for the slippage. When disaggregated by disability category, students with specific learning disabilities and other health impairments accounted for slightly more than 78% of the students with disabilities taking the regular assessments and they performed the least well on the assessments. Students with specific learning disabilities made up 52.57% of the students who took regular assessments and 13.32% were proficient. Students with other health impairments were 25.56% of the students with disabilities who took regular assessments, and 16.84% were proficient. An additional 6.38% of students with disabilities performed at Level 3/grade level proficiency and with the continuing use of evidence-based strategies may achieve at level 4 or 5 in the future.
F	Grade 8	
G	HS	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	15,489	2,539	22.67%	56.40%	16.39%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	Grade 4	16,732	2,021	19.72%	56.40%	12.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C	Grade 5	16,711	1,790	17.82%	56.40%	10.71%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
D	Grade 6	16,189	1,424	11.57%	56.40%	8.80%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
E	Grade 7	15,923	1,354	9.95%	56.40%	8.50%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
F	Grade 8	14,691	883	7.41%	56.40%	6.01%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G	HS	10,877	1,310	11.60%	54.70%	12.04%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	The slippage for performance of third grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
B	Grade 4	The slippage for performance of fourth grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
C	Grade 5	The slippage for performance of fifth grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
D	Grade 6	The slippage for performance of sixth grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
E	Grade 7	The slippage for performance of seventh grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
F	Grade 8	The slippage for performance of eighth grade students with disabilities is due to the implementation of new math assessments in 2018-19. The assessments were more rigorous and based on changes to/more rigorous content and achievement standards.
G	HS	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with

disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

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: <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/testing-and-school-accountability/school-accountability-and-reporting/accountability-data-sets-and-reports#students-with-disabilities-assessment-participation-with-and-without-accommodations>

Copy and paste the link into your internet browser. When the link has been accessed, click on the 2018-19 Students with Disabilities Assessment Participation With and Without Accommodations to download the report. When the report is downloaded, click on it to view the report.

For participation of students with disabilities (SWD) on alternate assessments, use the link: <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/testing-and-school-accountability/school-accountability-and-reporting/accountability-data-sets-and-reports#reports-of-supplemental-disaggregated-state,-school-system-and-school-performance-data>

Copy and paste the link into your internet browser. When the link has been accessed, scroll down to/click on Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data near the bottom of the page. Click on Disaggregated Performance Data for 2018-19 to download the report. When the folder/zip file has downloaded, click on it to open the folder, 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 NCEXTEND1, 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 downloaded file folder/zip file, an updated version of the web browser used may be necessary or a different web browser may be used.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

North Carolina set its baseline year for math assessments to 2018. In 2018-19, North Carolina implemented new math assessments that were more rigorous and based on changes to more rigorous content and achievement standards.

Students with disabilities performed at significantly lower levels on the new math assessments at each grade level than they performed on the previous year math assessments. Students without disabilities also performed at significantly lower levels on the new math assessments at each grade level than they performed on the previous year math assessments.

The EC Division will be providing LEAs with data profiles that will include three to four years of trend data for graduation rates, dropout rates, math and reading proficiency rates, and disciplinary disproportionality, as well as other data. The data profiles will be shared with the LEAs at Regional meetings, to be held in the Spring. The purpose of the data profiles is to assist LEAs with root cause analyses and identification of evidence-based practices to improve results for submission as part of each LEA's annual Self-Assessment.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline data for math for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	2.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data	0.44%	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.50%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	293	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For Indicator 4a, 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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 June 2019, 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 must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	293	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For Indicator 4b, 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 June 2019, 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)

If YES, select one of the following:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	65.60%	65.50%	65.40%	65.30%	65.20%
A	61.56%	Data	66.25%	66.45%	66.78%	66.80%	66.85%
B	2005	Target <=	15.30%	15.30%	15.20%	15.20%	15.10%
B	16.82%	Data	13.55%	13.74%	13.87%	13.98%	14.02%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
C	2.27%	Data	1.98%	1.90%	1.89%	1.83%	1.81%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	65.00%	65.50%
Target B <=	15.00%	14.50%
Target C <=	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	181,547

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	122,563
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	25,307
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,760
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	321
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1,154

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	122,563	181,547	66.85%	65.00%	67.51%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	25,307	181,547	14.02%	15.00%	13.94%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,235	181,547	1.81%	2.00%	1.78%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]							

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2014	Target >=	51.50%	36.70%	37.00%	37.30%	37.60%
A	36.65%	Data	50.26%	36.65%	36.91%	35.86%	34.93%
B	2014	Target <=	20.50%	21.60%	21.30%	20.00%	19.70%
B	21.60%	Data	21.98%	21.60%	21.64%	21.73%	21.91%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	38.00%	38.00%
Target B <=	19.40%	19.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	20,111

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	6,967
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,175
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	199
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	10

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,967	20,111	34.93%	38.00%	34.64%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,384	20,111	21.91%	19.40%	21.80%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target ≥	82.34%	82.34%	82.50%	82.50%	82.50%
A1	82.34%	Data	82.34%	84.80%	85.34%	84.85%	84.82%
A2	2013	Target ≥	35.08%	35.08%	35.20%	35.20%	35.20%
A2	35.08%	Data	35.08%	36.71%	34.53%	34.73%	37.90%
B1	2013	Target ≥	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%
B1	82.52%	Data	82.52%	83.17%	82.67%	82.96%	82.89%
B2	2013	Target ≥	34.24%	34.24%	34.46%	34.46%	34.46%
B2	34.24%	Data	34.24%	35.05%	33.38%	34.14%	37.40%
C1	2013	Target ≥	81.81%	81.81%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
C1	81.81%	Data	81.81%	84.07%	82.94%	84.01%	83.55%
C2	2013	Target ≥	52.05%	52.05%	52.17%	52.17%	52.17%
C2	52.05%	Data	52.05%	54.46%	50.98%	50.69%	54.12%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 ≥	82.55%	83.00%
Target A2 ≥	35.40%	35.50%
Target B1 ≥	82.60%	83.00%
Target B2 ≥	34.50%	35.00%
Target C1 ≥	82.20%	83.00%
Target C2 ≥	52.20%	53.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

6,395

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	38	0.59%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	843	13.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,038	47.51%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,924	30.09%

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	552	8.63%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,962	5,843	84.82%	82.55%	84.92%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,476	6,395	37.90%	35.40%	38.72%	Met Target	No Slippage

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	36	0.56%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	952	14.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,044	47.60%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,919	30.01%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	444	6.94%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,963	5,951	82.89%	82.60%	83.40%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,363	6,395	37.40%	34.50%	36.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	40	0.63%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	790	12.35%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,115	33.07%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,248	35.15%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,202	18.80%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.	4,363	5,193	83.55%	82.20%	84.02%	Met Target	No Slippage
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.	3,450	6,395	54.12%	52.20%	53.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	XXX
B1	XXX
B2	XXX
C1	XXX
C2	XXX

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/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not 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 / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

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

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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 notice was issued July 31, 2019 to LEAs regarding the data submission due date for Indicator 7 (August 15, 2019) and how to submit the data. The majority of LEAs submitted data for Indicator 7 through NCDPI's Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS) by entering Entry and Exit Outcome forms into individual student records in CECAS. Twenty-eight (28) reporting LEAs (districts that did not

use CECAS at the time), used a State-provided Indicator 7 spreadsheet for submitting the data. The Indicator & Spreadsheet include 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 were included in the measurement. An Indicator 7 count was completed in CECAS and then the LEA certified count was combined with the spreadsheet data for the 28 reporting LEAs. This combined data completed the state data. All combined data was populated to the ECO COSF form to further validate the data and allow follow-up, if needed, with LEAs. The system also allowed districts to run reports to ensure students nearing or over age 6 completed an exit COS. LEAs will submit their data for the next APR using the Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS), the State's new accountability/reporting system that includes a required module for reporting for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for Child Outcomes A1, B1, B2, C1 and C2, but OSEP cannot accept the target for Child Outcome A2 because the State's end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 target for Child Outcome A2 to reflect improvement.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	26.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	46.37%	43.83%	46.22%	43.43%	44.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
691	1,571	44.24%	50.00%	43.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

15,465

Percentage of respondent parents

10.16%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 is sent a letter explaining the importance of the survey and guaranteeing the confidentiality of the parent's responses. The letter includes a web-based link and a QR code, either of which can be used to complete the survey. Parents also have the option of receiving a printed copy of the survey to complete and return.

When analyzing and reporting the data, 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.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

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.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

A comparison of the respondents in the annual sample to the representative survey distribution, suggests that certain response groups, as noted in the section about the State's analyses, did not match the representative sample surveyed. To offset the underrepresentation in the response group, the NCDPI once again oversampled in the survey distribution. The oversampling would normally impact the response rates of under-represented groups. For FFY 2018, the State no longer contracted with an out-of-state vendor for the distribution/receipt of the surveys and evaluation of the responses, but instead conducted these processes internally with assistance from one of the State's public universities during the evaluation process. By distributing and receiving the surveys within the state, it was anticipated that under-represented response groups would be more willing to respond to the survey. We also provided an electronic version/submission for the first time. Even with these changes the overall response rate and under-represented response groups remained similar to the previous year. Two factors may have contributed to this. 1) Due to time involved in the State implementing the system for the first time without a third party vendor, surveys were distributed later than in past years. We received calls from some parents asking if they could submit the survey after the due date. 2) A major hurricane and significant flooding in September 2018 caused many families to relocate and over 1,000 surveys were returned to the NCDPI marked address unknown. The EC Division will also use its new Parent Listserv to communicate information about the survey for those parents included in the sample for the upcoming year. Because the Division is no longer contracting with a vendor to implement the system, staff will be able to monitor this process more closely. The EC Division is also seeking input from stakeholders regarding potential changes to the system in the future, including the possibility of streamlining the survey used, as some parents have indicated a 25-item survey is burdensome. Through our EC Division Parent Listserv, Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children, The Exceptional Children Assistance Center (ECAC), local EC Directors, and others, this Spring we will be soliciting input regarding a review of the current survey instrument used and a ranking of the questions most important to them for consideration if and when we revise the survey used.

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 15,465 surveys (school-age and preschool) were shipped to LEAs in the sample. A total of 948 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 10.16% which was slightly less than the previous year.

a) Distribution by Race

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference
African - American.....	31%	24%	- 7.....
White.....	52%	55%	+3
Other.....	17%	21%	+4

The FFY 2018 data suggest that African-American students were under-represented (24.0%) while students of other races, except white, were over-represented (21.0%).

b) Distribution by Grade

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference
Preschool.....	23%	28%	+ 5
School-Age.....	77%	72%	- 5

In FFY 2018, preschool children were over-represented (28%), while students in grades K-12 were under-represented (72%) as compared to surveys distributed. This gap was similar to the previous year.

c) Distribution by Disability

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference*
Autism.....	7%	16%	+ 9.....
Developmental Delay.....	12%	14%	+ 2
Intellectual Disability.....	9%	8%	- 1
Other Health Impairment.....	14%	15%	+ 1
Specific Learning Disability.....	29%	25%	- 4
Speech-Language Impairment.....	22%	16%	- 6
Other.....	7%	6%	- 1

In FFY 2018, students with autism (16%) were over-represented while students with speech-language impairments (16%) were under-represented and students with specific learning disabilities (25.0%) were slightly under-represented.

*Difference (percentage points) between the percentage of surveys distributed and the percentage of responders in the sample who completed the survey. The acceptable range of over/under-representation is typically +/-3 percentage points and was used to determine representativeness. Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

6

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	306	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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 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; Six (6) LEAs had disproportionate representation in 2018-19, which is determined by a risk ratio of $\geq 3.0^*$.

For the LEAs determined to have disproportionate representation in 2018-19, the NCDPI/the LEAs 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 an LEAs total enrollment and a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities.

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. required 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 examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d); and

3. reviewed the results of the examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d) included 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 the above steps, the NCDPI determined that the disproportionate representation in six (6) of the six (6) LEAs was not a result of inappropriate identification. Of the six (6) LEAs, five (5) were charter schools and one (1) was a small LEA. All of the six (6) LEAs experienced disproportionate representation in identification for the first time.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

6

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
56	0	306	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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 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; Fifty-six (56) LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in 2018-19 which is determined by a risk ratio of = 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, which 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 LEA's total enrollment and minimum cell size of 10 of a particular race/ethnicity in a specific disability category.

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 representation the State identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, the NCDPI:

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

3. reviewed the results of the 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 fifty-six (56) LEAs with disproportionate representation, zero (0) LEAs in 2018-19, or 0% had disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was a result of inappropriate identification.

The fifty-six (56) LEAs were comprised of forty-one (41) traditional LEAs, mostly small in size, and fifteen (15) charter schools, which had been identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability category for the first time. The transfer of students between traditional LEAs and charter schools has impacted the racial/ethnic make-up of the LEAs' enrollment and students with disabilities, which has contributed to disproportionate representation in some instances. Additionally, the twenty-one (21) LEAs that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability category the previous year made progress in reducing their risk ratio in the given racial and ethnic group and specific disability category.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

EC Division staff, along with LEA staff, presented at Regional meetings and held a session at the State's annual Exceptional Children Conference for LEAs determined to have disproportionate representation. One of the main purposes of the sessions was to assist LEAs regarding data drill-downs to conduct root cause analyses in order to identify effective evidence-based practices to improve results for students.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	84.62%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.82%	92.52%	91.55%	91.98%	90.22%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
42,951	38,223	90.22%	100%	88.99%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

North Carolina did not meet the 100% target for Indicator 11. It's FFY 2018 rate of 88.99% indicated slippage of 1.23 percentage points. The State's overall number of referrals received, for whom parents consented to evaluations, increased in 2018 from the previous year by 6.64%, but evaluations completed on time only increased by 5.20%.

LEAs reported that lack of personnel, including severe shortages in school psychology and related services personnel, turnover in personnel, and/or use of contracted personnel often led to the inability to process paperwork and conduct evaluations in a timely manner. Many of these LEAs are rural, high poverty, and Tier III in economic development. These factors, combined with geographic isolation, make hiring appropriately licensed staff or accessing

specialized evaluations challenging. Reasons for the 1,892 referrals beyond 46 days or more of meeting the 90-day timeline were mostly for failure to process paperwork in a timely manner, delay in getting parent consent, and other which often was cited by LEAs as lack of access to personnel. In some instances, the reasons was for weather delays.

However, the primary reasons for slippage this year from the previous year were: 1) a change from the previous data collection system (CECAS) to a new data collection system (ECATS); and 2) severe weather condition that caused delays in the referral paperwork not being processed in a timely manner.

EC Division staff analyzed data that may have been impacted by the change from one data collection (CECAS) to a new data collection system (ECATS). Near the end of the reporting period both systems were shut down. Although LEAs prepared for the shut down by completing the 90-day process as early as possible, 720 referrals that were initiated in the Spring and due during the systems' shut downs, missed the timeline by 1-2 days. Without the delay of these referrals the State rate would have been 90.68% and no slippage from the previous year would have been noted.

North Carolina has experienced a variety of weather-related emergencies in recent years, including hurricanes along the coast, significant flooding throughout the state, devastating tornadoes in the Piedmont region, and wildfires and snowstorms in the western part of the state. All of these have shuttered district and school doors and operations, sometimes for weeks at a time. Some LEAs have experienced multiple weather-related emergencies, and some schools have been shuttered permanently, requiring students to be relocated. Reportedly, 260 referrals during the 2018-19 school year did not meet the 90-day timeline due to weather delays; however, LEAs reported anecdotally that other referrals that did not meet the 90-day timeline initially due to weather delays were eventually reported under other reasons such as referral paperwork not processed in a timely manner or delay in getting parent consent for evaluation.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

4,728

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 - 780

6-15 days - 826

16-25 days - 541

26-35 days - 352

36-45 days - 337

46 days or more - 1,892

Total - 4728

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

Referral paperwork not processed in a timely manner - 2,778

Excessive student absences - 103

Weather delays - 260

Delay in getting parent consent for evaluation - 437

Other - 1150

Total - 4728

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

North Carolina has an established timeline (90 calendar days) from receipt of the referral to the placement determination. The 90-day timeline/receipt of the referral begins before parental consent to evaluate and includes the time the evaluation must be conducted, eligibility determined and a decision about placement made. The State-established timeframe does not provide for exceptions through State regulation or policy.

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

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 2018-19 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. The State-established timeframe does not provide for exceptions through State regulation or policy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The EC Division is planning organized, targeted technical assistance/training for identified LEAs that are having challenges with Indicator 11 compliance. The purposes of the targeted technical assistance/training is to ensure the understanding of the Child Find regulations, how to conduct root cause analyses, and building capacity to resolve non-compliance. The technical assistance/training will focus on the State's 90-day timeline, regulatory definitions, data accuracy and validity, and assisting the LEAs with drilling down into their child specific findings, infrastructure challenges they may be having, and identification of strategies to resolve non-compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
165	164	1	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The 165 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 165 LEAs with findings of non-compliance, the EC Division has verified that 164 LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements and 1 LEA was subsequently, correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

The LEA that subsequently correctly implemented the regulatory times has experienced significant turnover in administrative positions the last few years and had significant flooding from two major hurricanes in October 2016 and September 2018. The LEA is still recovering from these major, devastating events. As a result, the NCDPI has been providing ongoing and on-site technical assistance/support.

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

The 165 LEAs with non-compliant findings had 3,941 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2017-18. 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 2,572 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 1,369 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. EC Division staff reviewed the submitted data/evidence through CECAS and verified that the required corrections had been completed for all child-specific instances of non-compliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	1	1	0

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The NCDPI required the LEA 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 was 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 was 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 reviewed the data/records submitted to verify compliance. Since compliance was not achieved at that time, the NCDPI identified additional corrective action(s) to be issued, including entering into an agreement with the LEA, outlining the requirements the LEA had to implement for this and other regulatory requirements.

The LEA has experienced significant turnover in administrative positions the last few years and had significant flooding from two major hurricanes in October 2016 and September 2018. The LEA is still recovering from these major, devastating events. As a result, In addition to the agreement entered into with the LEA, the NCDPI has been providing ongoing, on-site technical assistance/support.

During the ongoing provision of technical assistance and support, the LEA was required to again access the reports tool in the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS), and update its data, at a minimum on a quarterly basis in order for the EC Division to review new data/student records to verify that the LEA with was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The LEA was also required to submit data/evidence to NCDPI's EC Division of changes made to improve processes as part of correcting non-compliance. Upon review of the new data/student records for the LEA, the EC Division has verified that subsequently the LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

As reported in the FFY 2017 APR, all child-specific findings of non-compliance were corrected. The LEA was one (1) of 146 LEAs with child-specific findings. The data reported in the FFY 2017 APR for the 146 LEAs was as follows: "The 146 LEAs with non-compliant findings had 3,371 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2016-17. 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 2,245 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 1,126 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. EC Division staff reviewed the submitted data/evidence through CECAS and verified that the required corrections had

been completed for all child-specific instances of non-compliance."

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	48.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.09%	98.84%	97.74%	96.48%	86.03%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,158
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	784
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,024

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2,706
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	180
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.	113

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	3,024	3,375	86.03%	100%	89.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
351

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 children delayed beyond 3rd birthday the following number of days:

1to5 days 37
6to15 days 42
16 to 25 days 54
26 to 35 days 35
36 to 45 days 30 46 days or more 153
TOTAL 351

Number of children delayed due to the following reasons:

a. Family Circumstance (e.g. illness/death in family, change in custody) 49
b. Child Circumstance (e.g. child was sick) 25
c. Part B Circumstance (e.g. delays completing evaluations, timely meetings, arranging transportation, enrollment, etc.) 267
d. Part C Circumstance (e.g. delays in notifying or issuing transition planning meeting invitation) 10
TOTAL 351

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

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)

Although North Carolina did not meet the target of 100% for Indicator 12, results improved from the previous year. The Department's transition data of 89.60% increased 3.57 percentage points or 4.15% from FFY 2017 (86.03%).

The primary causes of North Carolina's lower compliance rates for the last two years were most likely due to:

- 1) Local leadership not increasing the number of personnel when there is a subsequent increase in the number of notifications and referrals from one year to the next.
- 2) Local leadership restricting funding for summer evaluations when the number of notifications and referrals warrant sustained efforts during the summer.
- 3) Local leadership changing the processes of report writing without analyzing the potential impact on performance.
- 4) Weather related factors due to two significant hurricanes that affected North Carolina's coastal areas, and other weather-related emergencies disrupted school systems and communities.

The primary challenge has been in keeping up with the growth in the preschool programs between 2006 through 2019 while we improved the Child Find and Transition Process. In 2007 the state served only 3.2% of all children in the age group between 3-, 4- and Pre-K 5-years-old (as compared to census data). NC now serves 5.8% of all 3-, 4-, and Pre-K 5-year-old children. During the 2018 FFY, programs for children (ages 3, 4, & 5, including 5 year olds in kindergarten) grew by 8.03% between the December 1, 2018 and April 1, 2019 child count while the school-aged population of students (ages 6 - 21) with disabilities grew by only 1.68%. The assessment teams have been trained and can-do efficient processes; however, local

administration must analyze the data carefully to identify how many more preschool assessment team staff are needed from year to year as the numbers of referrals increase.

North Carolina has been participating in the DaSy Center's Part C to B Linking Cohort for several years. Through this group, we have established relationships with our Part C partners and have worked to develop testing strategies to compare our Indicator 12 data to the notification data Part C sends LEAs. The EC Division was pleased to find that our Indicator 12 data closely mirrored the notification data. The NC Part C to B linking group meets monthly and on January 9, 2020 received full approval to an amendment to continue our Interagency Data Sharing Agreement between the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the agency responsible for Part C, and NCDPI. The agreement allows the two agencies to share data and continue to find ways that our shared data sources can inform policies and practices that support better outcomes for children and families in North Carolina.

North Carolina has experienced a variety of weather-related emergencies in recent years, including hurricanes along the coast, significant flooding throughout the state, devastating tornadoes in the Piedmont region, and wildfires and snowstorms in the western part of the state. All of these have shuttered district and school doors and operations, sometimes for weeks at a time. The Division is considering recommendations and processes to provide clarification on how these instances can be handled.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	23	1	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Twenty-four (24) 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 2018, and 3) new Indicator 12 data for the first quarter of 2018. EC Division consultants reviewed the new data and information and verified that twenty-three (23) of the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Although one (1) of the LEAs was showing improved data, the LEA initially was not able to demonstrate that it was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The one (1) LEA was required to continue to submit new Indicator 12 data on a quarterly basis and have periodic in-person meetings and/or telephone conference calls regarding its data, challenges, resolutions, and progress until it was able to show it was subsequently and correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

The twenty-four (24) LEAs with non-compliant findings had one hundred eleven (461) child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2017-18. 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 two hundred eighty-four (284) child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. Ten (10) 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 one hundred seventy-seven (77) 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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority}}{\text{# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above}}} \right] \times 100$.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	94.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.07%	88.42%	88.14%	85.35%	85.45%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
443	548	85.45%	100%	80.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The source of the data provided for this indicator is monitoring from a five-year cycle of on-site program reviews. Since different LEAs are reviewed each year, the data and rates of compliance have fluctuated for the last few years. In 2017-18 North Carolina conducted on-site Program Compliance Reviews each year in thirty-eight (38) LEAs with students age 16 and above. During the 2018-19 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in fifty-five (55) LEAs, including eighteen (18) traditional LEAs, thirty-five (35) charter schools and two (2) state-operated programs (SOPs). Although that was an increase of 44% in the number of LEAs with on-site reviews, the number of IEPs reviewed decreased by 28% because 67% of the LEAs (charter schools and SOPs) have smaller numbers of students age 16 and above, which may have contributed to the slippage.

The training model used for the last few years may have also contributed to slippage and fluctuation of data. The NCDPI Exceptional Children Division, with the assistance of stakeholders that included other agencies, IHEs, other divisions within DPI, LEAs, parents and advocacy groups, developed a transition toolkit (an electronic live binder). For several years, staff provided training through a training of trainers model in each of the State's eight regions. All LEAs had the opportunity to send a representative(s) to participate in training to become a trainer in the use of the toolkit. Trainers were expected to train staff within their districts, and districts were expected to develop monitoring plans that identified their specific needs regarding compliance. The EC Division evaluated the training and its impact on transition outcomes and determined it did not have enough of a positive impact on transition outcomes as desired/expected. This was at least partially due to training not being re-delivered with fidelity, the amount of staff turnover following the initial training of trainers provided in the eight regions of the state, and lack of/limited LEA monitoring plans developed by the LEAs to identify their needs regarding compliance.

Because the limited/lack of training contributed to non-compliant findings regarding secondary transition IEP components, the EC Division, has developed and is piloting a training that begins with assisting an LEA with developing its monitoring plan based on the needs of the LEA. A self-monitoring tool is used and aligns exactly with the tool used by the state monitors during Program Compliance Reviews. The training also is maintaining use of the toolkit, which is a comprehensive resource. This is intended to build capacity within LEAs to effectively address transition, how to translate this to the written IEP, and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The EC Division will use the results of the pilot training to update its long-term training plan in collaboration with NCDPI's Career and Technical Education (CTE) Division and Vocational Rehabilitation.

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

State monitoring

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 2018-19 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in fifty-five (55) LEAs, including eighteen (18) traditional LEAs, thirty-five (35) charter schools, and two (2) state-operated programs (SOPs) 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).

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Thirty-four (34) of the thirty-eight (38) LEAs with Program Compliance Reviews and students with disabilities, ages 16 and older, had non-compliant findings in one or more student records. NCDPI staff reviewed additional (new) student records for each of the thirty-four (34) LEAs where non-compliance was identified and verified, as required, 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

Thirty-four (34) of thirty-eight (38) 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 (112 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 112 IEPs that had non-compliant findings related to the transition requirements.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

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

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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: States 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.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	39.50%	39.50%	39.50%	39.50%	39.75%
A	39.00%	Data	29.77%	31.88%	38.39%	27.27%	27.01%
B	2009	Target >=	62.50%	62.50%	62.50%	62.50%	62.75%
B	62.00%	Data	54.45%	61.11%	71.73%	62.51%	62.83%
C	2009	Target >=	73.50%	73.50%	73.50%	73.50%	73.75%
C	73.00%	Data	68.96%	72.71%	77.98%	78.14%	77.70%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	40.00%	40.00%
Target B >=	63.00%	63.00%
Target C >=	74.00%	76.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

FFY 2018 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	926
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	273
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	311
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)	44
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).	104

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	273	926	27.01%	40.00%	29.48%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	584	926	62.83%	63.00%	63.07%	Met Target	No Slippage
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)	732	926	77.70%	74.00%	79.05%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

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, or dropped out. A total of 2,669 Exiters were included in the 2019 follow-up survey. Of the 2017-18 school Exiters, a total of 926 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 34.96%.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The response data are representative for gender, race, and disability categories. However, the sample of Exiters who completed the survey is under-represented by those who dropped out (-4 percentage points). Students who dropped out represented approximately 17% of the students in the sample, and only 13% of the respondents. This potential of nonresponse bias, regarding those who dropped out, is similar to previous year's discrepancies between the population and sample.

To examine potential nonresponse bias, a comparison of the known characteristics of all 2017-18 Exiters to the characteristics of those who completed the survey was conducted and noted in the following table.

School Leaver Characteristics.....	Total School Exiters (%).....	Completed Survey (%).....	Difference* (percentage points)
GENDER			
Female.....	34%	35%	+1
Male.....	66%	65%	-1
RACE			
African American.....	35%	33%	-2
Hispanic.....	14%	12%	-2
White.....	45%	47%	+2
Other Races.....	6%	8%	+2
DISABILITY			
Autism.....	8%	9%	+1
Intellectual Disability.....	12%	10%	-2
Other Health Impaired.....	21%	23%	+2
Serious Emotional Disability.....	5%	4%	-1
Specific Learning Disability.....	50%	48%	-2
Other Disabilities.....	4%	5%	+1
TYPE OF EXIT			
Graduated.....	78%	80%	+2
Certificate.....	4%	6%	+2
Dropped Out.....	17%	13%	-4
Reached Maximum Age.....	1%	1%	+/-0

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

	Yes / No
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

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Due to concerns about low response rates and to provide LEAs with better and more useful data, the State changed its data collection process three (3) years ago. Each LEA conducted survey interviews and submitted the data collected to the NCDPI-EC Division. The overall response rates have improved since have LEAs conduct the surveys. During training for LEAs in the sample, the importance of the a strong response rate and response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect a the time they left school were emphasized. This year LEAs were asked to probe further if exiters indicated they did not want to respond to the survey. Although, the response rate for those students who dropped out was similar to the previous year, LEAs were able to collect additional information about those exiters who chose not to respond to the entire survey, particularly those who dropped out. The EC Division will further analyze this information to: 1) identify additional steps that can be taken to increase the response rate for students who have dropped out of school; 2) share strategies with LEAs to use when conducting survey interviews; and 3) use in future trainings about how to better engage those students who dropped out of school.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported "that, while response data are representative based on gender, race, etc., the sample of Exiters that completed the survey is underrepresentative". The State further indicated that it compared the characteristics of all 2016-2017 Exiters to the characteristics of those who completed the survey and noted the results of the comparison in a table found in the Indicator; however, the table was not included in the FFY 2018 APR. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not the response data were representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	38
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	13

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	86.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	50.00%	16.67%	48.84%	38.46%	47.37%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
-----	------	------

Target >=	XXX	XXX
-----------	-----	-----

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
13	38	47.37%	75.00%	85.00%	34.21%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Data indicated that the number of resolution sessions in 2018-19 (38) was the same as the number of resolution sessions the previous year; however five (5) fewer resolution sessions were resolved through settlement agreements. Feedback from participants involved in resolution sessions, as well as other anecdotal information gathered throughout the year, indicated that in several instances the intent was to complete the process in order to go to due process hearings and/or collect attorney fees rather than resolve the disagreements during resolution sessions. The NCDPI-EC Division continues to make other aspects of the dispute resolution process available by providing access to mediations and facilitated IEP meetings that are conducted by highly trained and qualified mediators and individuals. The Division will also, through various means of communication, continue to encourage the increased use of early resolution processes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	48
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	21
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	9

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 11, 2019 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, including proposing 2019 targets, as required. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and the clarification period. This information and opportunity to provide input, including proposing 2019 targets was also shared at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meetings held December 16, 2019 and January 21, 2020. SSIP stakeholders were also provided an opportunity to provide input via email submission. 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.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	71.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	77.27%	65.71%	61.54%	78.95%	54.55%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
21	9	48	54.55%	75.00%	85.00%	62.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Dr. Nancy T. Johnson

Title:

SPP/APR Coordinator

Email:

ntjohnso@uncc.edu

Phone:

704-576-2760

Submitted on:

04/29/20 11:54:53 AM