

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps														
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 49.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 50%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>														
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 7.79%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 9.21%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 7.00%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for this indicator. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 12.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 13.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations;</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1268 1419 1463"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1268 678 1385">Grade</th> <th data-bbox="678 1268 808 1385">FFY 2005 Data</th> <th data-bbox="808 1268 938 1385">FFY 2006 Data</th> <th data-bbox="938 1268 1068 1385">FFY 2006 Target</th> <th data-bbox="1068 1268 1199 1385">FFY 2005 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1199 1268 1329 1385">FFY 2006 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1329 1268 1419 1385">FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1385 678 1463"></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="678 1385 1068 1463">Reading</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="1068 1385 1419 1463">Math</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data demonstrating that the LEAs identified in the State's survey as being out of compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.160(c) and (f) and 300.320(a)(6)</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target										
	Reading			Math												

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	3	98.9%	99.9%	99.6%	99.1%	99.9%	99.6%	of identification. The State reported that 100% of LEAs corrected noncompliance in this area.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
	4	98.9%	99.9%	99.6%	99.0%	99.9%	99.6%	
	5	98.8%	99.9%	99.6%	98.9%	99.9%	99.6%	
	6	98.4%	99.6%	99.5%	98.4%	99.9%	99.3%	
	7	98.3%	99.4%	99.3%	98.0%	99.9%	99.1%	
	8	98.0%	99.5%	99.1%	98.0%	99.9%	99.1%	
	HS	87.9%	100%	95.5%	89.3%	100%	95.5%	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 targets.							
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:  C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:							OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	
		Reading			Math			
	3	55.9%	55.2%	61.0%	46.9%	49.5%	61.3%	
	4	53.7%	58.2%	58.9%	39.4%	44.1%	70.3%	
	5	60.8%	62.9%	67.3%	35.1%	40.0%	62.9%	
	6	48.2%	51.8%	53.4%	31.6%	37.7%	58.9%	
	7	55.0%	56.7%	58.8%	31.0%	35.2%	49.3%	
	8	56.4%	60.7%	63.4%	30.0%	36.4%	48.3%	
	HS	16.5%	85.0%	20.0%	45.0%	27.5%	51.6%	
	The State confirmed that although the data in the APR are not consistent with the 618 data in Table 6, the data in the APR are accurate.  The data that the State reported in the APR represent slippage for 3rd grade reading and high school (HS) math, and progress for all other grades for reading and math.  The State met its FFY 2006 targets for HS reading, did not meet its FFY 2006 targets for reading in other grades, and did not meet its targets for any grades in math.							

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 2.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 9.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) in its FFY 2004, FFY 2005, and FFY 2006 APRs. The State provided the required information for LEAs identified in the FFY 2004 and 2005 APRs.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the LEAs identified in FFY 2004 and 2005 to make changes to their policies, as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). Some of these actions have been completed. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the remaining actions have been completed.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must also describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	<p>§300.170(b).</p>																
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 816 1419 1195"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day</td> <td>61.56%</td> <td>63.18%</td> <td>61.59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day</td> <td>16.82%</td> <td>16.20%</td> <td>16.87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.27%</td> <td>2.34%</td> <td>2.18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for Indicators 5A and 5B, and slippage for Indicator 5C, from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 target for Indicator 5A, and did not meet its FFY 2006 targets for Indicators 5B and 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	61.56%	63.18%	61.59%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	16.82%	16.20%	16.87%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.27%	2.34%	2.18%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	61.56%	63.18%	61.59%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	16.82%	16.20%	16.87%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.27%	2.34%	2.18%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]																										
7. Percent of preschool children 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. [Results Indicator; New]	The State’s FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 532 1419 1214"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 532 1060 704">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 532 1180 704">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 532 1299 704">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 532 1419 704">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 704 1060 773">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 704 1180 773">1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 704 1299 773">1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 704 1419 773">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 773 1060 907">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 773 1180 907">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 773 1299 907">10%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 773 1419 907">7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 907 1060 1011">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 907 1180 1011">27%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 907 1299 1011">32%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 907 1419 1011">16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1011 1060 1115">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1011 1180 1115">32%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1011 1299 1115">32%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1011 1419 1115">30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1115 1060 1214">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1115 1180 1214">33%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1115 1299 1214">25%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1115 1419 1214">47%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP. The State confirmed that it used a census approach to collect data for this indicator.	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1%	1%	1%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	7%	10%	7%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	27%	32%	16%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32%	32%	30%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	25%	47%	The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1%	1%	1%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	7%	10%	7%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	27%	32%	16%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32%	32%	30%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	25%	47%																							
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services	The State provided FFY 2006 baseline, targets, and revised improvement	OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in																								

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 26%.</p>	<p>the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, separate baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for the percent of parents of preschool children if the State uses a different survey for the parents of preschool children. The State reported in its FFY 2006 APR that two versions of the 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 had the same meaning, the same standard applied, and measures from the two scales could be aggregated. NCDPI aggregated the measures from the two scales.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2005 baseline and the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified in FFY 2006 or FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination. The State provided this information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State: (1)</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 11.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 31.3%. The State did not meet its target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 44 of 68 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification corrected non-compliance.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that, using the results from the Self-Assessment for Disproportionate Representation, it: (1) determined efficient action steps that can be taken in order to address the issue; (2) required LEAs to revise policies, practices and/or procedures that address inappropriate identification as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of the letter; and (3) required LEAs, in their Continuous Improvement Performance Plans (CIPP) due to the State on March 15, 2008, to report on how the LEA will revise policies and/or procedures. The State reported that it also increased effective educational programs for all students in all classes to reduce inappropriate evaluations and placements.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>provided baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification; (2) provided a description of how the State made that determination; and (3) provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table also required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, for the 68 LEAs identified by the State as having significant disproportionality with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities or the placement in particular educational settings of these children and disciplinary actions, documentation that the State, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. provided for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices used in the identification or placement to ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices comply with the requirements of IDEA;</li> <li>2. required the LEAs to reserve the maximum amount of funds under section 613(f) of the IDEA to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LEAs, particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly overidentified;</li> </ol>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and</p> <p>3. required the LEAs to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices.</p> <p>The State reported that, in its FFY 2005 APR/SPP, it had confused/interchanged the terms “significant disproportionality” with “disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification” and clarified that the State did not identify any districts in FFY 2005 with significant disproportionality. The State reported that it identified 43 districts with significant disproportionality in FFY 2006 and described the actions that these districts are required to take under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). OSEP appreciates the State’s effort in this area.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the</p>



**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must also describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and review of the district's practices for compliance with these requirements.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 85.44%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84.62%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 105 of 111 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>noncompliance the State reported that the LEAs were required to: (1) review their data by school and identify barriers to compliance and submit, for approval by the State, the review along with targeted improvement activities in the March 15, 2008 submission of the LEA's Continuous Improvement Performance Plan (CIPP); and, (2) submit data on a quarterly basis for review and verification by the State.</p>	<p>uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 48.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, the State reported that 11 out of 14 LEAs timely corrected noncompliance. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the LEAs were required to: (1) submit individual district technical assistance plans that included a revision and submission of the 2005-2006 CIPP with revised improvement activities; (2) submit quarterly transition data to the State for monitoring and verification; and (3) receive an on-site technical assistance visit by the State to review polices, practices and procedures to identify specific issues.</p> <p>For the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, 92 out of 98 LEAs timely corrected the noncompliance. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the LEAs were required to: (1) submit individual district technical assistance plans that included a revision and submission of the 2006-2007 CIPP with data comparison and revised improvement activities by March 15, 2008 and completed Transition Plans with steps, timelines, and roles/responsibilities by May 15, 2008; (2) submit quarterly transition data to the State for monitoring and verification; and (3) receive an on-site technical assistance visit by the State to review polices, practices and procedures to identify specific issues.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 60%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 78 of 88 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the remaining uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the LEAs were put on notice that the remaining 46 records are to be corrected and documentation of the correction submitted with the CIPP on March 15, 2008. The LEAs were also required to: (1) meet with State personnel to review all of the activities described in the CIPP and revise as necessary; and (2) conduct mandatory staff development, coordinated with the State, of all staff serving students with IEPs 14 and above.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 88.24%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 79.45%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, the State reported that 570 out of 646 findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data that are consistent with the required measurement for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that each LEA will be required to meet with State personnel to review all activities described in its CIPP and revise as appropriate, and submit a comprehensive training plan to the State by March 14, 2008, and the State will conduct an on-site verification visit to verify correction of records.</p> <p>The State also reported that 290 of 365 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 were corrected in a timely manner, and an additional 65 out of the remaining 75 findings of noncompliance have since been corrected. The State did not provide information on the correction of the remaining 10 findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86.67%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two hearings. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 67%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance</p>

**North Carolina Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 86%.</p>	<p>in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 84%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>