



# Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

---

Report on Educational Performance of Children  
with Disabilities

*SL2019-165 (SB343)*

---

## STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION VISION: Every public school student in North Carolina will be empowered to accept academic challenges, prepared to pursue their chosen path after graduating high school, and encouraged to become lifelong learners with the capacity to engage in a globally-collaborative society.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MISSION: The mission of the North Carolina State Board of Education is to use its constitutional authority to guard and maintain the right of a sound, basic education for every child in North Carolina Public Schools.

### ERIC DAVIS

Chair: Charlotte – At-Large

### JILL CAMNITZ

Greenville – Northeast Region

### TODD CHASTEEN

Blowing Rock – Northwest Region

### ALAN DUNCAN

Vice Chair: Greensboro – Piedmont-Triad Region

### REGINALD KENAN

Rose Hill – Southeast Region

### DONNA TIPTON-ROGERS

Brasstown – Western Region

### MARK ROBINSON

Lieutenant Governor: High Point – Ex Officio

### AMY WHITE

Garner – North Central Region

### J. WENDELL HALL

Ahoskie – At-Large

### DALE FOLWELL

State Treasurer: Raleigh – Ex Officio

### OLIVIA OXENDINE

Lumberton – Sandhills Region

### JAMES FORD

At-Large

### CATHERINE TRUITT

Secretary to the Board: Cary

### VACANT

Southwest Region

## NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

**Catherine Truitt, State Superintendent :: 301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825**

In compliance with federal law, the NC Department of Public Instruction administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

### **Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:**

Thomas Tomberlin, Director of Educator Recruitment and Support, NCDPI  
6301 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6301 / Phone: (984) 236-2114 / Fax: (984) 236-2099

**Visit us on the Web: [www.dpi.nc.gov](http://www.dpi.nc.gov)**

## **Annual Report**

- (1) A copy of the following documents that were submitted, received, or made public during the year:
- a. The most recent State performance plan and any amendments to that plan submitted to the Secretary of Education.
  - b. Compliance and monitoring reports submitted to the Secretary of Education.
  - c. The annual report submitted to the Secretary of Education on the performance of the State under its performance plan.
  - d. Any other information required under IDEA to be made available to the public.

# NC Part B

FFY2019

# State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

## **Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

However, this was a year unlike any other due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19. North Carolina's Governor issued Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders, and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020 through the remainder of the school year. NCDPI Staff worked tirelessly and virtually to provide technical assistance and professional development to assist Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with mitigating the impact of the pandemic on children/students, families, staff, and the provision of education and services.

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 changes to Indicators 1 and 8, at the Council's quarterly meetings in 2020. 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 at the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) external stakeholder meeting in November 2020.

By June 1, 2020, 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 Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS) 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/2018-19-lea-apr>.

The FFY 2019 APR contains information specific to measuring progress or slippage against State targets for Indicators 1, 2, 4a-b, 5a-c, 6a-b, 7a-c, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. The FFY 2019 APR does not contain information for Indicators 3b-c because due to COVID-19, states were issued waivers to exempt them from administering statewide assessments for the 2019-20 school year. Additional information about the impact of COVID-19 is provided in the introduction section, "Additional information related to data collection and reporting." North Carolina uses OSEP-approved sampling plans for Indicators 8 and 14. North Carolina distributed the information to access the electronic surveys through local education agencies involved in the Indicator 8 sample. Each LEA, in the approved Indicator 14 sample, collected and submitted its data electronically to the NCDPI-ECD.

### **Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

This was a year unlike any other due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19, which significantly impacted data collection and reporting for Indicators 7, 11, 12, and 13. States were given waivers that exempt them from administering statewide assessments for the 2019-20 school year, so no data was collected for Indicators 3b-c. The North Carolina Governor issued Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020 through the end of the school year. COVID-19 also impacted the number of staff available to conduct evaluations, provide instruction and administer programs. Specific information about the impact on data collection and reporting for each of the

indicators impacted by COVID-19 and what was done to mitigate the impact is included in the sections of the report for the individual indicators.

Initially, LEAs were understaffed and overwhelmed with priorities including:

- arranging to continue to provide meals normally provided by the schools to students - purchasing and/or arranging for laptops or iPads for student use at home
- arranging internet access for students who didn't have such access at home
- providing time and support for teachers and service providers to develop remote learning plans and prepare to provide remote instruction and remote evaluations, when possible; and
- researching laws/regulations regarding privacy as it relates to providing remote instruction and remote evaluations, when possible in the home.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection and reporting, the State took the following steps:

- Provided guidance on the continuation of FAPE, through daily and weekly updates that included recommendations, templates, and resources for use by LEAs
- Held multiple webinars to review guidance, process questions, and as a result developed an ongoing FAQ to address special education services during the pandemic
- Provided other frequent virtual opportunities for technical assistance and professional development to assist LEAs with mitigating the impact of the pandemic on children/students, families, staff, and the provision of education and services.
- Developed a repository of resources for LEAs' use
- Held Weekly Office Hour WebEx Meetings for Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
- Conducted COVID-19 Impact Focus Groups

Stakeholder focus groups were conducted virtually and used focused questions to seek input about the impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation. Stakeholder focus groups were conducted for rural/small LEAs, urban/large LEAs, charter schools, and parents (three times, including one in Spanish) and twenty-nine LEAs and 28 parents participated. Feedback from the focus groups, indicated that initially staff and parents were overwhelmed and operating in a crisis mode. Some reported that there was too much and changing communication which caused confusion while others reported that communication was lacking. While reportedly things have improved, academic achievement, the availability of staff to provide instruction and services, keeping students engaged, students dropping out, inclusion of students with their non-disabled peers, and the social and emotional well-being of students, parents and staff during the ongoing pandemic continue to be concerns. Many reported improved communication between families and schools, parent's increased knowledge of their children's education, staff with increased technology knowledge and capacity, teachers and staff who have gone beyond their expected duties, have been flexible and adapted quickly to promote student achievement and well-being. Additionally, a total of 208 students activated an electronic survey the EC Division used to receive information from students about the impact of COVID-19. 154 students completed responses to questions, though not every student responded to all seven (7) survey questions. The majority of students preferred in-person instruction and were primarily concerned about academics (grades, course credit, passing end-of-grade/end-of-course tests and being in contact with teachers/service providers). They also expressed some concern about the social/emotional issues of connecting with friends. One third of the students indicated they never think about dropping out of school, while about one third of the students indicated they had thought about dropping out with approximately 10% of the students responded they think about dropping out all of the time. Many students reported frustration and a sense of sadness and stress, disruption and falling behind academically due to the pandemic. A handful of students reported some positive outcomes, such as "getting work don on time", "I like wearing masks", and "It has helped with my anxiety. Kids can't bully me."

The focus groups and student surveys provided NCDPI with powerful and impactful information. Staff have used/will continue to use the information when providing support for data collection and reporting as well as other technical assistance and professional development.

## **Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

323

### **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 that is uploaded as an attachment.

### **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 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) and other topical institutes have been consistently provided by the EC Division over the years. Spring 2020 quarterly meetings and other trainings were conducted virtually due to COVID-19 and the Governor's Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency, issued stay-at-home orders, closed schools/school buildings, state offices, and other businesses.

When the EC Division developed its Strategic Vision, it reviewed its processes for technical assistance and professional development. As a result, some specific needs were identified, including a need for:

- Common processes for TA requests, follow up, and impact assessment
- Refinement of systems to use/align tiered systems of support
- Fidelity measures for all initiatives
- Stronger alignment with curriculum standards
- Additional support for developing and providing Specially Designed Instruction and progress monitoring for training, implementation, fidelity checks and evaluation of effectiveness
- Professional Development aligned to identified curricular or program needs
- Program implementation, including TA, coaching, and program evaluation
- Relationship to State Board of Education Goals and the EC Division Strategic Vision
- Use of LEA-SA data to drive universal, tailored, and customized support

The EC Division developed its tiered system of technical assistance 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 (LEA-SA) updates annually. The LEA-SA 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 SAs 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-SA 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-SA 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. Given the significant disruption caused by the pandemic, the EC Division worked with stakeholders to modify the LEA-SA process and tool to decrease burden and increase relevance. EC Division staff conducted enhanced analyses of each LEA's data as part of the modified process to inform more individualized support for local programs.

The EC Division provides customized support through regional staff and team structures. 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 monitoring and support to align with and use a tiered system model. The ECD expects system refinements to result in improved provision of services for LEAs, strengthened systems of support for students and families, and 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 and professional development systems.

### **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 9, 2020 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 changes



to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

By June 1, 2020, 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, 2020. 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/2018-19-lea-apr> . 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 under 2018-19 LEA APR click on the NC-SPP/APR 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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (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-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

North Carolina will report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and all other SSIP requirements on or before its April 1, 2021 SSIP submission.

**Intro - OSEP Response**

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on May 14, 2021, and the State's response is due under separate cover.

**Intro - Required Actions**

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2019	72.51%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	64.40%	67.30%	68.90%	70.32%	69.06%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target >=	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	10,745
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	14,818
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	72.51%

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
10,745	14,818	69.06%	80.00%	72.51%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

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

Extended ACGR

**If extended, provide the number of years**

5

**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 5-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is the ratio of youths with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma in 2018-19 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 2018-19 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 5-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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

North Carolina set its baseline year for graduation to 2019. With feedback from stakeholders, North Carolina selected the option to use its 5-year extended cohort graduation rate. The 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is a more accurate reflection of the number/rate of students with disabilities, who need additional time in school than the typical four years, to graduate with a standard high school diploma.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 ED Facts file specification FS009.

## 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	9.21%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.50%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	3.00%
Data	3.77%	4.65%	4.07%	3.95%	4.02%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target <=	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data</b>
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,764
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	566
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	99
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,941
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	58

**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

**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 2018-19 lag data, is:

$$\text{Rate} = 100 * \text{Numerator} \div (\text{Denominator} + \text{Numerator}) \quad 100 * 1,941 \div (50,090 + 1,941) = 3.73\% \quad \text{or} \quad 100 * 1,941 \div 52,031 = 3.73\%$$

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

Denominator: 2018 FirstMonth20DayMembership for youth with IEPs + Numerator

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,941	52,031	4.02%	3.00%	3.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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

**2 - OSEP Response**



## 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.**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 6</b>	<b>Grade 7</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade 9</b>	<b>Grade 10</b>	<b>Grade 11</b>	<b>Grade 12</b>	<b>HS</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	X										
<b>B</b>	Grade 4		X									
<b>C</b>	Grade 5			X								
<b>D</b>	Grade 6				X							
<b>E</b>	Grade 7					X						
<b>F</b>	Grade 8						X					
<b>G</b>	HS								X	X		

**Historical Data: Reading**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>FFY</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

<b>A</b>	Grade 3	99.60%	Actual	99.78%	99.66%	99.59%	99.63%	99.61%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	99.60%	Actual	99.80%	99.69%	99.64%	99.65%	99.67%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	99.60%	Actual	99.77%	99.72%	99.65%	99.66%	99.49%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	99.30%	Actual	99.41%	99.28%	99.31%	99.29%	99.21%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	99.10%	Actual	99.41%	99.22%	99.04%	99.13%	99.18%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	98.70%	Actual	99.03%	99.05%	98.98%	98.82%	98.79%
<b>G</b>	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>G</b>	HS	93.00%	Actual	96.62%	96.50%	96.83%	97.19%	96.80%

### Historical Data: Math

<b>Gro up</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>FFY</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	99.60%	Actual	99.76%	99.67%	99.61%	99.58%	99.61%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	99.60%	Actual	99.76%	99.68%	99.61%	99.62%	99.58%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	99.60%	Actual	99.75%	99.70%	99.65%	99.61%	99.38%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	99.10%	Actual	99.39%	99.23%	99.31%	99.10%	99.03%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	98.90%	Actual	99.34%	99.15%	99.05%	99.01%	99.01%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	2005	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	98.60%	Actual	98.99%	99.00%	98.95%	98.78%	98.55%
<b>G</b>	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

<b>G</b>	HS	95.00%	Actual	95.34%	95.92%	96.58%	97.79%	97.61%
----------	----	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**Targets**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>2019</b>
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%
Reading	G >=	HS	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%
Math	G >=	HS	95.00%

**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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>HS</b>
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>HS</b>
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			99.61%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			99.67%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			99.49%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			99.21%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			99.18%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			98.79%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			96.80%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			99.61%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			99.58%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			99.38%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			99.03%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			99.01%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			98.55%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			97.61%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

**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.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

**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		

**Historical Data: Reading**

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%



<b>A</b>	Grade 3	17.40%	Actual	18.38%	18.38%	18.55%	18.17%	17.89%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	15.00%	Actual	16.46%	15.62%	14.69%	15.91%	15.75%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	12.70%	Actual	13.47%	14.28%	13.91%	13.33%	13.73%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	12.70%	Actual	13.17%	14.06%	14.37%	14.48%	13.76%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	13.30%	Actual	13.04%	12.60%	13.26%	14.73%	12.76%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	2012	Target >=	30.30%	39.00%	47.70%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	10.10%	Actual	10.64%	10.29%	10.16%	10.21%	10.86%
<b>G</b>	HS	2012	Target >=	31.20%	39.80%	48.40%	57.00%	57.00%
<b>G</b>	HS	14.40%	Actual	13.53%	13.07%	13.38%	11.99%	12.57%

#### Historical Data: Math

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>FFY</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>A</b>	Grade 3	16.39%	Actual	20.77%	22.04%	22.71%	22.67%	16.39%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>B</b>	Grade 4	12.08%	Actual	19.24%	20.38%	19.68%	19.72%	12.08%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>C</b>	Grade 5	10.71%	Actual	16.79%	18.93%	18.44%	17.82%	10.71%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>D</b>	Grade 6	8.80%	Actual	10.35%	11.36%	12.97%	11.57%	8.80%
<b>E</b>	Grade 7	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%

<b>E</b>	Grade 7	8.50%	Actual	8.01%	8.68%	8.37%	9.95%	8.50%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	2018	Target >=	30.00%	38.80%	47.60%	56.40%	56.40%
<b>F</b>	Grade 8	6.01%	Actual	7.39%	7.37%	7.56%	7.41%	6.01%
<b>G</b>	HS	2018	Target >=	27.70%	36.70%	45.70%	54.70%	54.70%
<b>G</b>	HS	12.04%	Actual	10.99%	10.95%	10.81%	11.60%	12.04%

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	56.40%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	56.40%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	56.40%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	56.40%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	56.40%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	56.40%
Reading	G >=	HS	57.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	25.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	25.50%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	25.50%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	25.50%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	25.50%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	25.50%
Math	G >=	HS	22.50%

### 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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

#### Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

#### Date:

### Reading Proficiency Data by Grade



<b>Grade</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>HS</b>
scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A	Grade 3			17.89%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			15.75%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			13.73%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			13.76%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			12.76%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			10.86%	56.40%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			12.57%	57.00%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A	Grade 3			16.39%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			12.08%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			10.71%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			8.80%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			8.50%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			6.01%	25.50%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			12.04%	22.50%		N/A	N/A

**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.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

**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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	2.60%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target <=	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	312	0.00%	2.00%	0.64%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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 Local Education Agencies (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 2019 using 2018-2019 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.**

Two (2) LEAs had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs submitted a review of its policies, procedures, and practices pertaining to the suspension and discipline of students with disabilities in the school district, with a particular emphasis on those policies, procedures and practices which involved development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The reviews were submitted as part of the LEAs IDEA VI-B annual application. EC Division staff reviewed the documentation and made a determination about whether: 1) the policies, procedures and practices were compliant; and 2) if revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements were required. There were no findings of non-compliance in either LEA. Therefore, the LEAs were not required to revise their policies, procedures, and practices or report 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**



## 4A - Required Actions

## **Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

#### **Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

#### **Compliance 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), 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.



8	0	312	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
---	---	-----	-------	----	-------	------------	-------------

**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 Local Education Agencies (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 2019 using 2018-2019 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.**

Eight (8) LEAs had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs submitted a review of its policies, procedures, and practices pertaining to the suspension and discipline of students with disabilities in the school district, with a particular emphasis on those policies, procedures and practices which involved development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The reviews were submitted as part of the LEAs IDEA VI-B annual application. EC Division staff reviewed the documentation and made a determination about whether: 1) the policies, procedures and practices were compliant; and 2) if revisions to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements were required. There were no findings of non-compliance in any of the LEAs. Therefore, the LEAs were not required to revise their policies, procedures, and practices or report 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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*

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

**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 =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

### 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target $\geq$	65.50%	65.40%	65.30%	65.20%	65.00%
A	61.56%	Data	66.45%	66.78%	66.80%	66.85%	67.51%
B	2005	Target $\leq$	15.30%	15.20%	15.20%	15.10%	15.00%
B	16.82%	Data	13.74%	13.87%	13.98%	14.02%	13.94%
C	2005	Target $\leq$	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
C	2.27%	Data	1.90%	1.89%	1.83%	1.81%	1.78%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A $\geq$	65.50%
Target B $\leq$	14.50%
Target C $\leq$	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	182,939
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	124,057
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	24,273
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,975
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	281
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	917

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Education Environments</b>	<b>Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served</b>	<b>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	124,057	182,939	67.51%	65.50%	67.81%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	24,273	182,939	13.94%	14.50%	13.27%	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]	3,173	182,939	1.78%	2.00%	1.73%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**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

**Historical Data**

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2014	Target >=	36.70%	37.00%	37.30%	37.60%	38.00%
A	36.65%	Data	36.65%	36.91%	35.86%	34.93%	34.64%
B	2014	Target <=	21.60%	21.30%	20.00%	19.70%	19.40%
B	21.60%	Data	21.60%	21.64%	21.73%	21.91%	21.80%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target A >=	38.00%
Target B <=	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 9, 2020 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 changes

to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data</b>
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	20,909
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	6,397
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,551
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	402
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	11

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Preschool Environments</b>	<b>Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served</b>	<b>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,397	20,909	34.64%	38.00%	30.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,964	20,909	21.80%	19.40%	23.74%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

<b>Part</b>	<b>Reasons for slippage, if applicable</b>
A	<p>North Carolina did not meet the target of 38.00% for Indicator 6a. The Department’s least restrictive environment data of 30.57% reflects slippage from FFY2018 (34.64%), with 6392 children served in regular early childhood education programs. The total number of 3- to 5-year-olds served as of December 1, 2019 was 20,910 which represents an 814 increase from FFY2018 (20,096).</p> <p>Of the 220 LEAs that served 3 - 5 year old children with IEPs, 118 slipped in performance according to the data analyzed. For FFY2019 LEAs reported several factors impacting their ability to provide inclusive settings. Several LEAs reported concerns with the FFY2019 data accuracy. Noted issues included challenges with data migration as a new system, Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS), was implemented in FFY2019. LEAs further noted that the new data system lacks local reporting features to allow timely analysis as well as accuracy concerns within the new system. For instance, while data entered is reflected accurately in two reports a third report reflects the same data inaccurately. Most LEAs reporting data accuracy concerns also shared that there were not notable changes in local practices or resources despite significant shifts in data. Further analysis revealed concerns related to enrollment. Several smaller LEAs noted that a decrease in overall enrollment created a significant impact on the percent of children enrolled in inclusive settings while others reported notable increases in the number of children with significant developmental needs and/or who did not receive early intervention services. Additionally, many LEAs noted that inclusive settings, particularly for three-year-old children are limited with center closures as well as the eligibility requirements of some programs (e.g., Head Start and NC PreK). Three LEAs also noted a trend of families choosing to keep children at home and, therefore, not receiving services in inclusive settings. Several LEAs also noted a trend of “pull out” services for speech therapy with plans to shift these practices to ensure services in the regular early childhood education program. Additionally, LEAs noted a difference in kindergarten placement decisions, once a child leaves preschool environments, as having a negative impact on overall inclusive settings.</p> <p>Finally, a few LEAs noted significant leadership changes that resulted in a review and update of local practices resulting in better practices and more accurate data. Further, other LEAs noted the need to clarify reporting requirements that resulted in corrective professional learning regarding the selection of settings that match the actual service provision. These changes resulted in more accurate data and is now being used to advocate for more local options for needed inclusive settings.</p> <p>LEAs also noted several strategies to improve data accuracy as well as to increase the availability of inclusive settings. These LEAs along with several others noted the implementation of professional learning opportunities specific to local needs (e.g., data entry, settings definitions, making placement decisions, etc.). Many LEAs also</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>noted efforts to leverage and braid available funding sources, such as Head Start, NC PreK, Title I and private pay slots, to provide more inclusive settings.</p> <p>SEA improvement strategies include data entry training, correction of data migration and reporting issues, and making placement information more readily available for local review and analysis as well as IEP team use. Further the SEA will support LEAs with professional learning regarding the least restrictive environment and inclusive practices. The NC Preschool EC program is also receiving two intensive technical assistance (TA) opportunities from the National Center for Pyramid Innovations (NCPMI) with one focused on scaling up cross-sector Pyramid implementation across the state and the other focused on equity in program coaching. These NCPMI opportunities aim to increase and improve access to equitable and inclusive settings by improving practices.</p> <p>To further support preschool children with disabilities and their families, NCDPI partners with the North Carolina Early Learning Network (ELN), providing early learning communities with professional development and technical assistance based on guiding principles and values, aligned with the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. ELN promotes the development and successful participation of North Carolina's preschool-age exceptional children in a broad range of activities and contexts. Preschool coordinators have access to multi-tiered levels of support and facilitated cross-sector professional development. Program support focuses on expanding skills and increased family participation to improve the performance and success of preschool children in North Carolina.</p>
<b>B</b>	<p>North Carolina did not meet the target of 19.40% for Indicator 6b. The Department's least restrictive environment data of 23.72% reflects slippage from FFY2018 (21.80%), with 4959 children served in separate settings. The total number of 3- to 5-year-olds served as of December 1, 2019 was 20,910 which represents an 814 increase from FFY2018 (20,096).</p> <p>Of the 220 LEAs that served 3 - 5 year old children with IEPs, 102 slipped in performance according to the data analyzed. For FFY2019 LEAs reported several factors impacting this slip in performance.</p> <p>First, it is noted that a shift in how parentally placed private school students are reported has impacted this data. These students are now included in the separate settings data. Further, several LEAs reported an increase in referrals for children with significant needs while others also noted an increase in referrals from Part C. LEAs further shared concerns regarding the limited regular early childhood classroom settings that are available and willing to serve children with significant needs. Many noted, again, that many of the available inclusive settings have eligibility requirements (e.g., Head Start and NC PreK). The lack of funding for inclusive settings for three-year-old children was also specifically noted and appears to have resulted in more three-year-old children being served in separate settings. One LEA noted issues with staff turnover.</p> <p>One LEA also noted the lasting impacts of Hurricane Florence, which resulted in the loss of general education preschoolers due to long LEA closures while the system was rebuilding. The community also lost several childcare centers due to hurricane related closures. This left the LEA with no inclusive classrooms. Another LEA with a military base noted a high rate of children transitioning to the area with active IEPs with separate settings placements. This LEA further noted that more families than usual, with children with significant developmental needs, are stationed at this base due to the proximity of quality health care. Finally, one LEA noted that several Developmental Day Centers have seen a decrease in general education students which creates a ratio shift in the classrooms resulting in unintentional separate settings.</p> <p>LEAs also noted several improvement strategies. First and foremost, many LEAs are working to locally leverage community partnerships and funding sources to support inclusive environments. LEAs also reported providing professional learning regarding least restrictive environment decisions as well as child-centered practices. Many LEAs further reflected systemic and programmatic changes including offering more play groups inclusive of three-year-old children and restructuring teams and classroom arrangements. Others are offering more flexible scheduling including service provider location and small group services to meet family needs. One LEA also noted the use of progress monitoring data to inform changes to placement decisions as children progress towards meeting goals.</p> <p>SEA improvement strategies include providing professional learning opportunities regarding data collection and placement decisions as well as the values of inclusive education for all. Further, ensuring data is available in an accurate and timely matter for local consideration is key. Working with state level cross sector partners to address barriers to inclusive education across programs and settings is a priority. The NC Preschool EC program is also receiving two intensive technical assistance (TA) opportunities from the National Center for</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>Pyramid Innovations (NCPMI) with one focused on scaling up cross-sector Pyramid implementation across the state and the other focused on equity in program coaching. These NCPMI opportunities aim to increase and improve access to equitable and inclusive settings by improving practices.</p> <p>To further support preschool children with disabilities and their families, NCDPI also partners with the North Carolina Early Learning Network (ELN), providing early learning communities with professional development and technical assistance based on guiding principles and values, aligned with the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. ELN promotes the development and successful participation of North Carolina's preschool-age exceptional children in a broad range of activities and contexts. Preschool coordinators have access to multi-tiered levels of support and facilitated cross-sector professional development. Program support focuses on expanding skills and increased family participation to improve the performance and success of preschool children in North Carolina.</p>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**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

**Historical Data**

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2013	Target ≥	82.34%	82.50%	82.50%	82.50%	82.55%
A1	82.34%	Data	84.80%	85.34%	84.85%	84.82%	84.92%
A2	2013	Target ≥	35.08%	35.20%	35.20%	35.20%	35.40%
A2	35.08%	Data	36.71%	34.53%	34.73%	37.90%	38.72%
B1	2013	Target ≥	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%	82.52%	82.60%
B1	82.52%	Data	83.17%	82.67%	82.96%	82.89%	83.40%
B2	2013	Target ≥	34.24%	34.46%	34.46%	34.46%	34.50%
B2	34.24%	Data	35.05%	33.38%	34.14%	37.40%	36.95%
C1	2013	Target ≥	81.81%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.20%
C1	81.81%	Data	84.07%	82.94%	84.01%	83.55%	84.02%
C2	2013	Target ≥	52.05%	52.17%	52.17%	52.17%	52.20%
C2	52.05%	Data	54.46%	50.98%	50.69%	54.12%	53.95%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target A1 ≥	83.00%
Target A2 ≥	35.50%

Target B1 >=	83.00%
Target B2 >=	35.00%
Target C1 >=	83.00%
Target C2 >=	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

6,184

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

<b>Outcome A Progress Category</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Children</b>
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	33	0.53%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	885	14.31%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,931	47.40%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,889	30.55%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	446	7.21%

<b>Outcome A</b>	<b>Numerat or</b>	<b>Denomin ator</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	4,820	5,738	84.92%	83.00%	84.00%	Met Target	No Slippage



<b>Outcome A</b>	<b>Numerat or</b>	<b>Denomin ator</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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>	2,335	6,184	38.72%	35.50%	37.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

<b>Outcome B Progress Category</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Children</b>
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	49	0.79%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	921	14.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,858	46.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,969	31.84%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	387	6.26%

<b>Outcome B</b>	<b>Numerato r</b>	<b>Denomina tor</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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>	4,827	5,797	83.40%	83.00%	83.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

<b>Outcome B</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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>	2,356	6,184	36.95%	35.00%	38.10%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

<b>Outcome C Progress Category</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Children</b>
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	59	0.95%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	859	13.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,930	31.21%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,284	36.93%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,052	17.01%

<b>Outcome C</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,214	5,132	84.02%	83.00%	82.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were	3,336	6,184	53.95%	53.00%	53.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C1	<p>North Carolina had a 1.9 percent decrease in this area of performance when compared to the previous year's outcome data. Although the target percentage increased in this category (83%), North Carolina was less than one percent (.89%) away from achieving the state target.</p> <p>Factors impacting student growth and contributing to slippage were largely attributed to barriers resulting from COVID-19 which affected this category the most. Reportedly, districts not meeting the state target indicated virtual instruction, regression, virtual attendance, family dependability, and data collection as barriers influencing student performance.</p> <p>School closure and stay at home orders, caused an abrupt disruption of services and routines that led to regression in some students. Specially designed instruction for the youngest learners experiencing delays was administered using computer devices. The quality and effectiveness of this instructional delivery method was not adequate to achieve the desired growth for all goals or measures of growth. Several LEAs indicated concerns that parents continue to provide support in this area rather than promote independence due to inexperience with developmental expectation and age appropriate skills. There were virtual observations and evaluations that demonstrated needs not present when students were previously evaluated.</p> <p>LEAs also noted virtual attendance presented challenges for child outcomes. Attendance issues resulted from poor internet connections, sharing computers or limited accessibility to devices. Adult inability to assist in the virtual lessons, student's limited attention to virtual services and/or refusal to attend also impacted participation in live sessions.</p> <p>Limited family experience and environmental stressors during the final months of instruction and data collection also contributed to slippage. In the midst of facing economic challenges and hardships of the pandemic, families were tasked with supporting the use of technology platforms for virtual instruction; however, not all families were familiar with the process and/or did not have internet access. In addition, teams struggled with how to support families in embedding opportunities for the development of appropriate behaviors to meet children's own needs at home.</p> <p>Data collection was reportedly challenging during the remote learning process. Typically occurring during the final weeks of preschool services, data collection consists of interviews, observations, team/provider input, and progress measuring tools. The collective use of these tools was not readily available. Parent input was heavily relied upon; however, families were not always available for interviews and collaboration. Teachers and related service providers experienced complications when virtually determining the rate of growth and progress at the school year's end. LEAs indicated instances where students were not available for further virtual observation. Student data previously collected was used to make final child outcome determinations when exit data could not be collected.</p> <p>In addition to the pandemic, inconsistent ratings were also indicated. Several LEAs have determined a need for formal and/or additional professional development on completion of the Child Outcome Summary process for both teachers and clinicians. These training measures are sought to increase understanding of the process as well as reliability of those evaluating progress to ensure tracking and data collection yields an accurate account of student performance in this outcome area.</p> <p>When examining reasons for the decrease in this outcome area, the timing of the pandemic and process of data collection must be taken into consideration. Additionally, the appropriateness of behavior is a very subjective</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	area. The format for data collection of those exiting the program during this period were not the equivalent of those previously utilized. With only preexisting evidence collected prior to the closures, the evaluators relied heavily on family input with little to no firsthand input from other service providers. The collection process was further impacted by rater reliability. Evaluators were required to assess students virtually when virtual observation options were available with sometimes limited devices and connectivity. Data collection was also performed by evaluators who were not previously experienced with the Child Outcome Summary process.

**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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Local Education Agencies (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. LEAs then submitted their data 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. All data was populated to the ECO COSF form to further validate the data and allow follow-up, if needed, with LEAs.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For the current APR, data submissions were submitted via Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS), the State's new accountability/reporting system. There were several anomalies experienced with this new process and the impact of COVID-19, resulting in some resubmissions. COVID-19 also impacted the capability to provide the in-depth regional training the EC Division would normally provide for the introduction of a new data collection system. To mitigate the anomalies experienced and the impact of COVID-19, NCDPI put corrective measures in place as well as a State-provided Indicator 7 spreadsheet as an alternative data collection tool in the event issues were not resolved in a timely effective manner. Helpdesk accessibility, instructions on running the report and correcting errors as well as training videos were provided to support LEAs in this process. Additionally, the EC Division designated weekly, virtual office hours to provide additional support to districts with Federal Reporting questions around Indicator 7 and virtually conducted stakeholder focus groups using focused questions to seek input about the impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation. Stakeholder focus groups were conducted for rural/small LEAs, urban/large LEAs, charter schools, and parents (three times, including one in Spanish) and twenty-nine LEAs and 28 parents participated. Feedback from the focus groups, indicated that initially staff and parents were overwhelmed and operating in a crisis mode. Some reported that there was too much and changing communication which caused confusion while others reported that communication was lacking. While reportedly things have improved, academic achievement, the availability of staff to provide instruction and services, keeping students engaged, students dropping out, inclusion of students with their non-disabled peers, and the social and emotional well-being of students, parents and staff during the ongoing pandemic continue to be concerns. Many reported improved communication between families and schools, parent's increased knowledge of their children's education, staff with increased technology knowledge and capacity, teachers and staff who have gone beyond their expected duties, have been flexible and adapted quickly to promote student achievement and well-being. The stakeholder focus groups provided NCDPI with powerful and impactful information. Staff have used/will continue to use the information when providing support for data collection and reporting as well as other technical assistance and professional development.

North Carolina has measures in place for improving outcomes for all children. Extensive training to understand the outcomes is ongoing. Training is regularly provided throughout the year, formalized and through self-paced modules. One of the most widely used tools by LEAs to evaluate student progress is the Teaching Strategies Gold,

a system for assessing children from birth through kindergarten. Our cross-sector partners at the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Division of Child Development and Early Education (DCDEE), along with the Office of Early Learning at the NC Department of Public Instruction have been in collaboration to coordinate efforts to bring Teaching Strategies Gold to all preschool classrooms. To further support preschool children with disabilities and their families, NCDPI also partners with the North Carolina Early Learning Network (ELN), providing early learning communities with professional development and technical assistance based on guiding principles and values, aligned with and reported in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. ELN promotes the development and successful participation of North Carolina's preschool-age exceptional children in a broad range of activities and contexts. Preschool coordinators have access to multi-tiered levels of support and facilitated cross-sector professional development. Program support focuses on expanding skills and increased family participation to improve the performance and success of preschool children in North Carolina. Additionally, NC is receiving TA support from CASEL and ECTA/DaSy Centers. CASEL is providing targeted TA to NC to align MTSS efforts with school wide SEL efforts. NC is also currently in a cross-state cohort focusing on improving local Child Outcomes data use. Through the TA support, NC is identifying opportunities for improving communication and support between the state and local preschool programs to facilitate local Child Outcomes data use. The TA from ECTA/DaSy Centers will align with the NCPMI intensive TA since NC PPM practices affect and support positive child outcomes. Also, aligning communication about NC PPM implementation with the communication and support focused on improving Child Outcomes data supports NC's focus on PPM implementation and scale-up efforts as a strategy for supporting Child Outcomes for children enrolled in preschool programs.

#### **7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **7 - OSEP Response**

#### **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

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

### 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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 Year	Baseline Data
2019	49.36%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	43.83%	46.22%	43.43%	44.24%	43.98%

## Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	50.00%

## FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,823	3,693	43.98%	50.00%	49.36%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

17,634

Percentage of respondent parents

20.94%

**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 17-item survey with a Likert scale for responses. The 17 items were previously developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability (NCSEAM) as part of a 25-item survey for parents of children ages 5-21. For parents of preschool children, NCDPI used a corresponding 17-item survey with a Likert scale for responses. The 17 items were previously developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability (NCSEAM) as part of a 25-item survey for parents of preschool children. 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 to be used to complete the survey. Parents also have the option of receiving a printed copy of the survey to complete and return. The items on each survey were fully equated so that they have the same meaning, the same standard applies, and measures from the two surveys can be and were aggregated by NCDPI.

When analyzing and reporting the data, North Carolina used a percentage calculation of parents' responses of "strongly agree" and "very strongly agree" for a simple majority of survey items indicating their perception that schools facilitated their involvement. The calculation was similar to the standard used in previous years for the 25-item survey and yielded similar results.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) used a 17-item survey with a Likert scale. For parents of children ages 5-21, NCDPI used a corresponding 17-item survey, with the same Likert scale, that addresses family involvement. 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.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	
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. However, these percentages were impacted by the fact that parents selected the race/ethnicity and disability category of their children rather than tracking surveys to identified students/children. Thus, survey responses may not directly correspond to the race/ethnicity or disability category of the children and also account for missing information when a parent chose not to respond to the questions about race/ethnicity or disability category. For future surveys, the State will consider the possibility of tracking surveys to identified students/children in the sample.

For FFY 2019, as a result of feedback from parent organizations and other stakeholders, LEAs in the sample, sent the notices, that included access to the survey link via email, to parents. This change resulted in an increase in the number of surveys received for FFY2019. The EC Division also sought input from stakeholders regarding changes to the system, streamlining the survey used, as many parents indicated a 25-item survey was 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, we solicited input regarding a review of the current survey instrument used and a ranking of the questions most important to them for consideration, and as a result revised the survey used to include 17 of the 25 original questions.

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

A total of 17,634 parent surveys (school-age and preschool) were distributed among LEAs in the sample. A total of 3,693 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 20.94% which was higher than the previous year.

a) Distribution by Race

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference
African-American.....	31%	25%	- 6
White.....	52%	54%	+2
Other.....	17%	20%	+3
Missing .....		1%	

The FFY 2019 data suggest that African-American students were under-represented (25.0%) as in previous years.

b) Distribution by Grade

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference
Preschool.....	10%	4%	-6
School-Age.....	90%	96%	+6



In FFY 2019, preschool children were under-represented (4%), while students in grades K-12 were over-represented (96%) as compared to surveys distributed. This gap was opposite of the previous year.

c) Distribution by Disability

Surveys.....	Distributed.....	Returned.....	Difference*
Autism.....	11% .....	25% .....	+14
Developmental Delay.....	8% .....	11% .....	+3
Intellectual Disability.....	8% .....	9% .....	+1
Other Health Impairment.....	18% .....	9% .....	- 9
Specific Learning Disability.....	35% .....	17% .....	- 18
Speech-Language Impairment....	14% .....	15% .....	+1
Other.....	6% .....	11% .....	+5
Missing .....	.....	3% .....	

In FFY 2019, students with autism (25%) were over-represented while students with other health impairments (9%), and specific learning disabilities (17%) were under-represented. Also students in other disability categories were slightly over-represented and it should be noted that there was a higher percentage of parents who selected multiple disabilities as the category of disability.

\*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)**

North Carolina set its baseline year for Indicator 8 to 2019. With input from stakeholders, North Carolina revised its survey instrument by reducing the number of questions in the survey from twenty-five (25) to seventeen (17). Although similar to the standard used in previous years, the State also changed the calculation for rate of parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## **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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### **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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

**9 - Indicator Data**

**Not Applicable**

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	0%

**FFY 2019 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.

30

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4	0	293	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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;

Four (4) LEAs had disproportionate representation in 2019-20, which is determined by a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0^*$ .

For the LEAs determined to have disproportionate representation in 2019-20, 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 their annual LEA Self-Assessment updates an examination of local policies, procedures and practices under 618(d) along with assurances in their IDEA VI-B annual funding application; 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 four (4) of the four (4) LEAs was not a result of inappropriate identification. The four (4) LEAs were small charter schools. All four (4) 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 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**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 2019, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### **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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

**10 - Indicator Data**

**Not Applicable**

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	0%

**FFY 2019 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.

66

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
36	0	257	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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;

LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in 2019-20 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) along with assurances in their IDEA VI-B annual funding application; 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 thirty-six (36) LEAs with disproportionate representation, zero (0) LEAs in 2019-20, or 0% had disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was a result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected



**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**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

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	84.62%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.52%	91.55%	91.98%	90.22%	88.99%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received</b>	<b>(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
23,175	19,496	88.99%	100%	84.13%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage**

EC Division staff analyzed data to determine the reason(s) for slippage from the previous year. Reasons for slippage included a lack of needed personnel to complete evaluations, which was exacerbated by COVID-19 and a change to North Carolina's process for collecting the data in the new accountability/reporting system, Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS), that created some confusion for those in the field completing the process.

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

3,679

**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 - 561

6-15 days - 499

16-25 days - 308

26-35 days - 158

36-45 days - 155

46 days or more - 1998

Total - 3679

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

Referral paperwork not processed in a timely manner - 2086

Excessive student absences - 77

Weather delays - 26

Delay in getting parent consent for evaluation - 406

Other - 933

COVID-19 - 151

Total - 3679

**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.

**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 2019-20 data were collected for all LEAs through the Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS), North Carolina's new accountability system for collecting data for students with IEPs. Allowable exceptions, that were removed from the number of referrals received, were included in ECATS 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; children whose parent(s) repeatedly failed or refused to produce them for the evaluation; and a state exception based on the Governor's Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 significantly impacted data collection for Indicator 11. Children could not be produced for evaluations because of the Governor's Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020 through the end of the school year. COVID-19 also impacted the number of staff available to conduct evaluations. As a result, the number of children for whom the state's referral to placement timeline was implemented decreased significantly from the previous year. Additionally, COVID-19 impacted the capability to provide the in-depth regional training the EC Division would normally provide for the introduction of a new data collection system, Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS).

Initially, LEAs were understaffed and overwhelmed with priorities including:

- arranging to continue to provide meals normally provided by the schools to students - purchasing and/or arranging for laptops or iPads for student use at home
- arranging internet access for students who didn't have such access at home
- providing time and support for teachers and service providers to develop remote learning plans and prepare to provide remote instruction and remote evaluations, when possible; and
- researching laws/regulations regarding privacy as it relates to providing remote instruction and remote evaluations, when possible in the home.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection, the State took the following steps:

- Collected data regarding the number of children who could not be produced for evaluation due to COVID-19 for Indicator 11 and conducted follow-up to ensure that those children received evaluations and had IEPs developed, if determined eligible, as soon as safe to do so and in compliance with the Governor's Executive Orders
- Held Weekly Office Hour WebEx Meetings  
The purpose of these office hour meetings was to respond to content & technical questions about data and data submission for Indicators 7, 11, 12, & Child Count.
- Conducted COVID-19 Impact Focus Groups  
Stakeholder focus groups were conducted virtually and used focused questions to seek input about the impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation.  
Stakeholder focus groups were conducted for rural/small LEAs, urban/large LEAs, charter schools, and parents

(three times, including one in Spanish) and twenty-nine LEAs and 28 parents participated. Feedback from the focus groups, indicated that initially staff and parents were overwhelmed and operating in a crisis mode. Some reported that there was too much and changing communication which caused confusion while others reported that communication was lacking. While reportedly things have improved, academic achievement, the availability of staff to provide instruction and services, keeping students engaged, students dropping out, inclusion of students with their non-disabled peers, and the social and emotional well-being of students, parents and staff during the ongoing pandemic continue to be concerns. Many reported improved communication between families and schools, parent's increased knowledge of their children's education, staff with increased technology knowledge and capacity, teachers and staff who have gone beyond their expected duties, have been flexible and adapted quickly to promote student achievement and well-being. The stakeholder focus groups provided NCDPI with powerful and impactful information. Staff have used/will continue to use the information when providing support for data collection and reporting as well as other technical assistance and professional development.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
156	153	3	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The 156 LEAs with findings of non-compliance were required to access the reports tool in the new Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS) to report 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 not verified by the State to be 100% compliant in the first quarter was reviewed in the second quarter 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 156 LEAs with findings of non-compliance, the EC Division verified that 153 LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements and 3 LEAs were subsequently, correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The 156 LEAs with non-compliant findings had 4,728 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2018-19. 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 Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS) that 2,836 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. LEAs were also required to submit data/evidence through ECATS to the NCDPI, as soon as possible and no later than one year from notification of the non-compliant findings, that the remaining 1,892 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. EC Division staff reviewed the submitted data/evidence through ECATS and verified that the required corrections had been completed for all child-specific instances.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## **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**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # 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.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

### **12 - Indicator Data**

#### **Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### **Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	48.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.84%	97.74%	96.48%	86.03%	89.60%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,337
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	673
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,474
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.	2,833
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	91
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.	227

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	2,474	3,513	89.60%	100%	70.42%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 had a significant impact on data collection for this indicator. Eight hundred fourteen (814) children could not be produced for evaluation because of the Governor's Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020 through the end of the school year. COVID-19 also impacted the number of staff available to conduct evaluations.

Initially, priorities for local education agencies (LEAs) included:

- arranging to continue to provide meals normally provided by the schools to students



- purchasing and/or arranging for laptops or iPads for student use at home
- arranging internet access for students who didn't have such access at home
- providing time and support for teachers and service providers to develop remote learning plans and prepare to provide remote instruction and remote evaluations (if/when possible); and
- researching laws/regulations regarding privacy as it relates to providing remote instruction and remote evaluations (if/when possible) in the home.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection, the State took the following steps:

- Collected data regarding the number of children who could not be produced for evaluations due to COVID-19 for Indicator 12 and conducted follow-up to ensure that those children received evaluations and had IEPs developed if determined eligible as soon as safe to do so and in compliance with the Governor's Executive Orders.

- Held Weekly Office Hour WebEx Meetings

The purpose of these office hour meetings was to respond to content & technical questions about data and data submission for Indicators 7, 11, 12, & Child Count.

- Conducted COVID-19 Impact Focus Groups

Stakeholder focus groups were conducted virtually and used focused questions to seek input about the impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation.

Stakeholder focus groups were conducted for rural/small LEAs, urban/large LEAs, charter schools, and parents (three times, including one in Spanish) and twenty-nine LEAs and 28 parents participated. Feedback from the focus groups, indicated that initially staff and parents were overwhelmed and operating in a crisis mode. Some reported that there was too much and changing communication which caused confusion while others reported that communication was lacking. While reportedly things have improved, academic achievement, the availability of staff to provide instruction and services, keeping students engaged, students dropping out, inclusion of students with their non-disabled peers, and the social and emotional well-being of students, parents and staff during the ongoing pandemic continue to be concerns. Many reported improved communication between families and schools, parent's increased knowledge of their children's education, staff with increased technology knowledge and capacity, teachers and staff who have gone beyond their expected duties, have been flexible and adapted quickly to promote student achievement and well-being.

The stakeholder focus groups provided NCDPI with powerful and impactful information. Staff have used/will continue to use the information when providing support for data collection and reporting as well as other technical assistance and professional development.

**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**

1,039

**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:

1 to 5 days ..... 32

6 to 15 days ..... 58

16 to 25 days ..... 45

26 to 35 days ..... 56

36 to 45 days .....	52
46 days or more .....	796
TOTAL .....	1039

Number of children delayed due to the following reasons:

a. Family Circumstance (e.g. illness/death in family, change in custody).....	38
b. Child Circumstance (e.g. child was sick).....	7
c. Part B Circumstance (e.g. delays completing evaluations, timely meetings, arranging transportation, enrollment, etc.)..	146
d. Part C Circumstance (e.g. delays in notifying or issuing transition planning meeting invitation).....	34
COVID Delay.....	814
TOTAL.....	1039

**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)**

\*\*As of the date of 4/23/2021 - NCDPI policy and monitoring consultants have verified placement decisions on most if not all delayed students All 1039 student records will be checked for verification of compliance as soon as possible and no later than one year from notification of the non-compliant finding.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
27	27	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Twenty-seven (27) 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 2018 to March 2019, and 3) new Indicator 12 data for the first quarter of the 2019-20 school year. EC Division consultants reviewed the new data and information and verified that twenty-seven (27) of the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

The twenty-seven (27) LEAs with non-compliant findings had 351 child-specific findings of non-compliance in 2018-19. 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 198 child-specific instances of non-compliance had been corrected. Twelve (12) 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 153 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

### 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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

### 13 - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	94.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.42%	88.14%	85.35%	85.45%	80.84%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition</b>	<b>Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
202	358	80.84%	100%	56.42%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

During the 2018-19 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in twenty-eight (28) LEAs, including thirteen (13) traditional LEAs and fifteen (15) charter schools. The source of the data provided for this indicator is monitoring from a five-year cycle of on-site program reviews, which was suspended when North Carolina's Governor issued stay-at-home orders and closed schools in mid-March due to COVID-19. As a result program reviews were postponed in twenty-two (22) LEAs, including thirteen (13) traditional LEAs, eight (8) charter schools, and one (1) State-Operated Program (SOP) until the Spring of 2021. Due to COVID-19 resulting in the postponement of the on-site program reviews, the number of IEPs, for students age 16 and above, reviewed decreased by 34.7% which contributed to the slippage. Since different LEAs are reviewed each year, the data and rates of compliance have fluctuated for the last few years and this fluctuation was exaggerated due to the significant decrease in the number of IEPs reviewed. Another factor that contributed to the slippage was a change to the IEP form used in the new Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS). The new IEP form did not include a previously used question regarding "evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on an age appropriate transition assessment(s)." As a result, many IEPs did not include this required transition information.

**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 2019-20 school year, data for this indicator were gathered through on-site Program Compliance Reviews conducted in twenty-eight (28) LEAs, including thirteen (13) traditional LEAs and fifteen (15) charter schools with students age 16 and above. An additional twenty-two on-site Program Compliance Reviews were postponed due to COVID-19 (see additional information about this indicator). 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).

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 had a significant impact on data collection for this indicator. Due to the Governor's Executive Orders that declared a state of emergency due to COVID-19, instituted stay-at-home orders and closed schools/school buildings beginning March 16, 2020, on-site Program Compliance Reviews were suspended, as required, for the remainder of the 2019-20 school year. As a result, on-site program reviews were postponed for twenty-two (22) LEAs, including thirteen (13) traditional LEAs, eight (8) charter schools, and one (1) State-Operated Program and the number of IEPs, for students age 16 and above, reviewed decreased by 34.7%. To mitigate the impact of this, North Carolina will conduct program reviews for the 16 LEAs affected in the Spring 2021 and provide additional training regarding transition requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Twenty-one (21) 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 twenty-one (21) 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 the Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS).

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

Twenty-one (21) 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 (105 individual student records) for NCDPI review and verification. If an IEP(s) could be accessed electronically through ECATS, the NCDPI Monitoring Consultants verified correction using the electronic submission/version of the IEP(s). NCDPI verified the correction of the 105 IEPs that had non-compliant findings related to the transition requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

### **13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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**

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
---------	----------	-----	------	------	------	------	------

A	2009	Target >=	39.50%	39.50%	39.50%	39.75%	40.00%
A	39.00%	Data	31.88%	38.39%	27.27%	27.01%	29.48%
B	2009	Target >=	62.50%	62.50%	62.50%	62.75%	63.00%
B	62.00%	Data	61.11%	71.73%	62.51%	62.83%	63.07%
C	2009	Target >=	73.50%	73.50%	73.50%	73.75%	74.00%
C	73.00%	Data	72.71%	77.98%	78.14%	77.70%	79.05%

### FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	40.00%
Target B >=	63.00%
Target C >=	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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 2019 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	733
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	209
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	304
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)	26
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).	53

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Number of respondent youth</b>	<b>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	209	733	29.48%	40.00%	28.51%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	513	733	63.07%	63.00%	69.99%	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)	592	733	79.05%	76.00%	80.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

North Carolina conducts a sampling of local education agencies (LEAs), charter schools and State-Operated Programs (SOPs). A sampling calculator developed by the National Post-school Outcomes Center was used to establish representative samples through fiscal year 2020-21. District level information was entered into the Sampling Calculator and a sampling of districts, based on a multi-way cluster model, was produced. Samples were equivalent for size of district, percentage of males and 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 2,553 Exiters were included in the 2020 follow-up survey. Of the 2018-19 school Exiters, a total of 733 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 28.71% which was a decrease of 6.26 percentage points from the previous year.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

**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, disability categories, and type of exit. To examine potential nonresponse bias, a comparison of the known characteristics of all 2018-19 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)
<b>GENDER</b>			
Female.....	34% .....	35% .....	+1
Male.....	66% .....	65% .....	-1
<b>RACE</b>			
African American.....	35% .....	33% .....	-2
Hispanic.....	14% .....	12% .....	-2
White.....	45% .....	47% .....	+2
Other Races.....	6% .....	8% .....	+2
<b>DISABILITY</b>			
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
<b>TYPE OF EXIT</b>			
Graduated.....	78% .....	80% .....	+2
Certificate.....	4% .....	6% .....	+2
Dropped Out.....	16% .....	13% .....	- 3
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.

Question	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?	YES

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

**14 - OSEP Response**

**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 ED Facts 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	38
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	8

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

### 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 9, 2020 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 changes to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	86.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	16.67%	48.84%	38.46%	47.37%	34.21%

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
8	38	34.21%	75.00%	85.00%	21.05%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Data indicated that the number of resolution sessions in 2019-20 (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. It's important to note that the percentage of mediations resolved through written mediation agreements increased by 1.97 percentage points in 2019-20. 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

**15 - OSEP Response**

**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 ED Facts 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	76
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	40
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	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

**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 9, 2020 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 changes

to baseline data for Indicators 1 and 8. Advisory Council members were able to provide additional input by email prior to the submission of the initial APR and/or the clarification period. This information was also shared at a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder meeting held in the Fall 2020. 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	71.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	65.71%	61.54%	78.95%	54.55%	62.50%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
40	9	76	62.50%	75.00%	85.00%	64.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

#### 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 16 - OSEP Response

#### 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:**

Kelley J Blas

**Title:**

IDEA Part B Data Manager

**Email:**

kelley.blas@dpi.nc.gov

**Phone:**

984-236-2595

**Submitted on:**

04/26/21 8:55:43 AM

## FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

### Section A: Data Analysis

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).** (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

North Carolina will increase the 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (5YCGR) for students with disabilities (SWD), such that the gap is reduced between graduation rates for all students and students with disabilities.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?**

No

**If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below** (expressed as actual number and percentages).

**Baseline Data:** 5YCGR for SWD w

**Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission?** No

**FFY 2018 Target:** 76.12%                      **FFY 2019 Target:** 77.82%

**FFY 2018 Data:** 72.50%                      **FFY 2019 Data:** 73.10%

**Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met?** No

**Did slippage<sup>1</sup> occur?** No

**If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

<sup>1</sup> The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR?**      Yes

**If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**  
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

SPP/APR indicators – longitudinal analysis of 1, 2, 3c, 4a & b, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, & 14 reveal relatively flat performance in Indicators 1, 2, and 3c, except for 2018-19 math proficiency for SWD where there was slippage due to new, more rigorous assessments.

LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA): A modified version of the LEASA was administered in Year 5. Analyses of LEASA data were conducted to inform North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) support to LEAs. State-level LEASA analysis revealed relative strengths in LEA collaboration with families and the SEA, and relative need for growth with implementing evidence-based instruction/practices for SWD. The majority of LEA improvement plans (88%) are focused on academics for SWD and aligned with data on need to improve implementation of EBPs.

NC 2019-2020 Preschool Pyramid Model (PPM) - 36 LEAs participate, 2 LEAs are in readiness phase, and 3 Head Start offices serve 11 counties. The continued inclusion of 3 Head Start offices represents an opportunity to leverage Federal dollars and expand the program beyond LEA classrooms. With children learning remotely at the end of the 2019-2020 school year, none of these classrooms were able to be evaluated for fidelity. In 2019-2020, 365 classrooms implemented, a 7% increase in the number of classrooms participating. Although the number of participating LEAs contracted, the ongoing technical assistance provided to remaining LEAs allowed them to expand the project beyond its scope by a significant amount. View the NC Preschool Pyramid Model 2019-20 Annual report at: <http://bit.ly/NCELN2020Rpt>

NC Project AWARE - Year 2 Annual Report can be viewed at <http://bit.ly/NCAWARE2020> ; this is a key coherent improvement strategy for supporting/scaling up student social emotional learning and mental health, both essential elements for both graduation and post-school outcomes for SWD.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? No**

**If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).**

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period?** Yes

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator;**

**(2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.** (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted LEA Self-Assessment data collection, analysis, and reporting. LEAs were/are overwhelmed with foundational hierarchy-of-need priorities including:

- providing meals normally provided by the schools to students
- supplying laptops/tablets for student use at home
- arranging internet access for students who didn't have already
- providing time for teachers/service providers to develop remote instruction skills/learning plans and provide remote instruction and evaluations, when possible; and
- researching regulations regarding privacy when providing remote educational services

As such, our first SSIP-related mitigation strategy was to move due date for LEA Self-Assessment submission from June 30 to October 31. Next, we worked with LEA stakeholders to streamline LEASA by removing items for which LEAs would not have data and/or were deemed less relevant to a special-education-during-pandemic context. Also simplified the optional improvement plan template and allowed LEAs to submit their overall district improvement plan in lieu of the special education-specific plan. COVID also negatively affected data collection for Indicators 7, 11, 12, and 13 (metrics for our Continuum of Transitions strand in the logic model). In addition, states were given waivers that exempted them from administering statewide assessments for the 2019-20 school year, so no data was collected/ reported for Indicators 3b-c (metrics for our Academics strand).

To mitigate COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting, NCDPI took following steps:

- Provided frequent virtual opportunities for TA and professional development to assist LEAs with mitigating COVID impact on children/students, families, staff, and provision of education and services.
- Created flexibility for accruing required work hours in Occupational Course of Study
- Developed a repository of resources for LEAs use
- Held Weekly Office Hour meetings for Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
- Conducted COVID-19 Impact Focus Groups (See full report at: [http://bit.ly/NC\\_SWD\\_COVID](http://bit.ly/NC_SWD_COVID))

Preschool Pyramid Model (PPM) Child Outcomes: This year, there were questions about the validity of the reported data that might prevent this report from answering this question by comparing the 2019-2020 numbers to the national average. Specifically, many of the data points were collected before a full year had expired while other data were not collected in the classroom but rather via Zoom or using parent report. Only 7 LEAs reported data at all--a fraction of the number reported in previous years. Moreover, these data clusters are almost certainly non-random, which means that using them to generalize to the population of PPM counties would be suspect. Finally, because of the different data collection methods (e.g., early collection, Zoom, parent report), it would be necessary to cluster LEAs by method, but with so few counties reporting, there were categories that included only one county. Thus, conclusions could not be drawn about broad effects of the project or even the data collection method because these effects would be conflated with effects unique to the district in question.



**Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?** No

**If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action**  
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period?** Yes

**If “Yes”, describe each new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Data analyses by LEASA reviewers - EC Div. staff studied LEA data (3 years of APR data, LEA report cards, disproportionality data, discipline data, and Racial Equity report Card data) prior to conducting LEASA reviews this year. This gave reviewers a deeper knowledge of the LEA and they were better equipped to engage in follow-up coaching conversations as a result.

Review of Remote Instruction Plans (RIP) - each LEA was required to submit an RIP in 2019-20 and one of the items was specific to meeting the needs of SWD. We included this in our LEASA reviews to detect any LEAs that had particularly strong plans for SWD support during remote instruction so we can amplify those practices across the state and track those LEAs over time.

Professional Learning (PL) Library - <https://www.smore.com/st83m>; was developed to support local awareness/access to EC Div-sponsored PL; the courses are organized by alignment to the LEASA Core Elements to allow local EC leaders to select course that best match needs identified in their improvement plans

Special Education Remote Instruction Practice Guide (website) - was developed to support local EC practitioners in providing SDI/Related services in remote contexts. A wide range of topics (e.g., High-Leverage Practices in remote instruction, progress monitoring, significant disabilities, SEL, academics, accessibility for SWD with sensory impairments, etc.) are addressed and the resource is updated at least monthly. <https://sites.google.com/view/covidspedconsiderations/home-supplemental-optional> Separate resources were developed for local EC administrators re: policy, funding, and reporting updates related to COVID/remote instruction.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).**

LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) & Review cycle - LEASA was modified/ flexibility added to improvement plan to decrease burden on LEAs; review tool aligned to LEASA changes and new items support finer analysis; feedback sessions with individual LEAs conducted to summarize reviews and refine DPI support; LEASA submission and review rates were at all time high and local plans are increasingly focused on student outcomes.

EC Regional Data Teams (RDT) - ECD staff are assigned to 1 of these 4 teams, which are primary implementing unit of SSIP; RDTs analyze regional- and LEA-level root cause of low SWD graduation rate; implement/support universal SSIP outputs; provide tailored and customized data-based support, problem-solving, and coaching; provide forum for LEAs to collaborate through regional EC Director meetings and new director cohorts

Regional Support Teams - DPI's regional support structure organizes services to schools and districts through regional model. Regional Case Managers (RCM) lead support, facilitate/ participate in design, implementation, and evaluation of school improvement practices with partnership focus on districts designated as low performing.

SSIP Work groups - Data Literacy, Stakeholder & Family Engagement, Research-informed Practices, and Systems Coherence groups produce deliverables in alignment with SSIP priorities identified by stakeholders. External stakeholders, including parents of students with disabilities, are key participants in work groups. Examples of Year 5 work group outputs include: resource map of all ECD professional learning and PL Library, parent survey; HLPs for Remote Learning, and analyses of LEASA and review data.

Every Child Accountability and Tracking System (ECATS) - data system in 2nd year of operation and enhancements continue; MTSS module and early warning system now live; accessed by over 219,000 unique users and has captured over 335,000 IEP meetings, 129,000 eligibility meetings, and 4700 manifestation determination meetings; online professional learning series supporting use of ECATS for meaningful IEP processes launched this year.

NC State Improvement Project (NCSIP) - addresses achievement gaps for SWD through OSEP State Personnel Development Grants; developed evidence-based courses and coaching addressing literacy and math instruction for NC educators and partnered with IHEs to embed course content in teacher prep programs.

State Behavior Funding - special budget provision for services for students with significant behavioral and emotional needs; competitive grant is add-on funding for direct service staff salaries. Completion of SHAPE Quality Assessment is required component of application. 136 LEAs currently receive these funds.

NC SEL Implementation Team - key outcomes in FY 2019: vision statement and goals developed with stakeholder input, regional support structure implemented, SEL & Equity partnership established with 41 LEAs, and project evaluation plan adopted.

Facilitated Assessment of MTSS-School Level (FAM-S) - Schools from 36% (down from 68% in FFY 2018) of traditional LEAs and 3.5% (down from 11% in FFY 2018) of charter schools completed; ratings increased at least 10% across components

**Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):**

LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) and Review cycle - 98% of LEASAs were submitted and 97% of reviews were completed--these are among highest return rates since we started LEASA in 2016. With revisions to review tool, we were able to get a more detailed view of local improvement plan foci and coherence, conduct charter and traditional LEA comparisons, conduct state and regional comparisons, and operationalize our Theory of Action with direct matching of LEA-identified needs to current ECD professional learning offerings. LEASA process will be reviewed as part of our revised data and infrastructure analysis.

Regional Data Teams (RDT) - Despite being forced to conduct all RDT business remotely, ECD engagement in RDT meetings and extra-meeting activities remains high, as evidenced by LEA data analyses conducted prior to the LEASA reviews, high completion rate of LEASA reviews, participation on follow-up conversations with local EC leaders, and broad participation in feedback loops between SSIP leadership and RDT members. RDTs are primary implementing unit for SSIP and, while we may need to analyze HR allocation based on size and need differences across regions, RDTs will continue to serve this central role as we prepare for next SSIP cycle.

SSIP Work groups - Based on number of resources and deliverables developed by SSIP work groups (see previous item) which have been well-received/applied in LEAs, these groups will continue and expand in year ahead. Have added ECD staff to work groups to support revision of our data and infrastructure analysis and to increase communication and buy-in re: SSIP activities.

ECATS - User satisfaction with ECATS has grown to 94% and utilization of the required IEP module is robust. System repairs are conducted in a timely manner and feedback cycles from field to DPI and back support system maintenance/currency with policy and practice changes.

NC State Improvement Project (NCSIP) - project has external evaluator, annual report; performance over last 5 years led to development of new grant proposal

State Behavior Funding - outcomes are reviewed by NCDPI Behavior Support to determine if assessment has been completed; LEAs analyze SHAPE indicators to develop a Precise Problem Statement and determine improvement strategies. Data indicate policies and programs in school mental health are improving through MTSS, staffing, financing and data systems. Due to COVID many LEAs have not been able to implement action items and partner agencies have been unable to provide school-based services.

NC SEL Implementation Team - Outcomes assessed through implementation plan tracking tool. Given uptake with SEL professional learning, SEL and equity project, integration of SEL supports required in State Board's new School Mental Health policy, and increased need for SEL support for students and staff due to COVID, State SEL team work will continue to scale up in FY 2020.

Facilitated Assessment of MTSS-School Level (FAM-S) - MTSS implementation is improving for reporting LEAs. Further, given the ready infrastructure MTSS provides for our new SLD policy, we anticipate a return to pre-COVID utilization.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.** (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

LEA Self-Assessment (LEASA) and Review cycle - We will include analysis of the current LEASA process and tools as part of our upcoming data and infrastructure analysis to set new APR targets and SiMR (if changed). The LEASA was developed 6 years ago and much has changed in both evidence-based practices for SDI and related services, and the context in which these are provided in NC, including the evolution of ECATS which houses data not available 6 years ago. If used in future reporting periods, the LEASA process at least needs to be brought current with said research and context changes.

Regional Data Teams (RDT) - RDTs will be partnering with LEAs to support: implementation of EBPs aligned to local improvement plans, assessing and addressing potential learning losses for SWD as a result of the pandemic, setting FFY 2020-2025 APR targets, including SiMR selection, and continuing to build capacity with data analysis/problem solving for improvement using ECATS and other state data systems.

SSIP Work groups - We plan to invite additional EC Div staff to participate in SSIP work groups to support APR target setting and revision of our data and infrastructure analysis and to increase communication and buy-in re: SSIP activities. Work groups will be completing various aspects of the data and infrastructure analysis, working to engage external stakeholders, and communicate EC Div SSIP activities with other divisions within DPI. Anticipated outcomes include a revised SEA data and infrastructure analysis and new APR targets for FFY 2020-2025, including an updated or new SiMR.

ECATS - Next steps include: increasing SEA and LEA capacity to maximize reporting features, enhancing progress monitoring in the IEP module, and determining what system data may be used to reduce local reporting burden.

NC Project AWARE - see annual report at <http://bit.ly/NCAWARE2020>

CASEL Collaborating States Initiative - in the year ahead, we will work to increase internal NCDPI alignment/ investment in 3 Signature Practices; search for an external project evaluator, enhance the SEL website, explore SEL micro credential for LEA staff, and develop new courses for SEL & Trauma and School Mental Health Policy-aligned content

State Behavior Funding - The action plan will be updated for the 2021-2022 school year and will be reflected in the next PRC 29 grant application.

Facilitated Assessment of MTSS-School Level (FAM-S) - per the NC MTSS Strategic Plan (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T9SRgieiecturHibLyA94OJ6EKfofD2s/view>), implementation of FAM-S will continue to support PK-12 MTSS across the state. DPI MTSS experts will support local leaders in building infrastructure and capacity for collaborative problem-solving and we anticipate a district-level (FAM-D) to be released in FY 2020.

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?**

Yes

**If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):**

ARISE NC (Addressing and Reducing Inequities in Special Education) - targeted, intensive series of professional development aligned to NCSBOE equity goals and designed specifically for districts with significant disproportionality in the area of identification. Districts were invited to participate for one of two reasons: A) LEA designated as having significant disproportionality; or B) LEA on a Warning List for identification for at least 3 consecutive years and has potential to have significant disproportionality in future. Districts electing to participate were assigned a coach for individual mentoring/coaching sessions. Purpose is to improve district capacity to address and/or reduce significant disproportionality. LEA teams of district- and school-level administrators attend series of virtual workshops.

<https://sites.google.com/uncc.edu/arise-project/home>

High-Leverage Practices (HLPs) for Remote Instruction - The ECD translated CEC’s 22 HLPs for remote instruction, relying on the 5 Elements of Fidelity developed by the National Center for Intensive Intervention, to support the delivery of specially designed instruction and related services in virtual settings. The end result is a set of fact sheets for each HLP which provide observable features of quality services delivered virtually; they can be viewed at: [http://bit.ly/NC\\_RemoteHLPs](http://bit.ly/NC_RemoteHLPs) These are free/available to any visitor to the site.

Secondary Transition & Occupational Course of Study (OCS) Work Hours Tip of the Week 2020-2021 - weekly resources provided for transition planning and implementing OCS work hours during remote instruction.

**Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Foundations of Math and Reading Research to Classroom Practice (RRtCP) - Both courses provide educators and administrators with foundational knowledge needed to support students with persistent challenges in mathematics, dyscalculia, reading, and dyslexia. Course utilizes evidence-based strategies along with a comprehensive assessment system to guide instructional planning and delivery.

Data Based Individualization (DBI) - This scale-up of DBI (a research-based process for individualizing and intensifying interventions through the systematic use of assessment data, validated interventions, and research-based adaptation strategies) is being implemented at target schools in 1 LEA to increase educators' awareness of intensive intervention.

All Leaders - supports district and building leadership teams use Implementation Science for coordinating academic initiatives, including building readiness, implementation stages, implementation teams, and implementation drivers. Participants gain skills to develop, implement, and evaluate district and school plans that support the improvement of core content instruction and achievement of students with disabilities.

Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) within an MTSS - This three-part EBP course provides LEA leaders and staff resources to establish common language and beliefs concerning specially designed instruction within a Multi-Tier System of Support, define the role of specially designed instruction in overall school improvement, provide adaptive and technical leadership that removes barriers to general and special education

**Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Math Foundations and RRtCP - Fidelity observation scores indicate a high level of implementation; participation and continuation scores from Developmental Reviews (DR) indicate a high level of commitment to improvement and a need for coaching. 87% of teachers implemented mathematics programs with fidelity, 56% of participants achieved a passing score on the post-assessment for RRtCP and FoM, and 46% of participating LEAs were above state proficiency rate for students in reading and math.

Data Based Individualization (DBI) - Student pre-assessment data was collected and teacher fidelity was monitored within LEA using DBI tools provided on NCII website/resources; student post-assessment data was not collected due to Covid19 (collection date was scheduled for May 2020).

All Leaders - Developmental review scores indicate districts are developing and improving measurable data driven goals within implementation plans for LEAs to strengthen implementation fidelity of designated initiatives as indicated on NCSIP district plan; engaged 52 attendees for face-to-face sessions (3 regional sessions and 1 local session), 11 attendees Canvas Overview Session, 19 attendees in NCSU Administrator Seminar Session.

Specially Designed Instruction within an MTSS - Follow-up meetings for Cohort A and B were planned but had to be cancelled due to COVID. COVID also affected the completion rate of both courses but prompted the need to have the content transitioned to self-paced courses and available to all educators. Through \*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

increasing Gen Ed/EC collaborations, SDI Implementation Guide, Leadership Repository, and Foundations of SDI within an MTSS course went live on December 1, 2020; the course provides a SDI walkthrough tool but no data is collected at the state level.

\*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.



**Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices.** (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

School Mental Health Policy - SHLT-003 was adopted by the NC State Board of Education to ensure LEAs are equipping staff to meet the increasing SEL/mental health needs of students as a result of the pandemic. These supports are critical for SWD who are at increased greater risk for SEL/mental health needs due to isolation, learning loss, access issues to remote instruction as a result of disability, etc.

SLD Policy - NCDPI developed SLD policy in 2016 that restricted use of severe discrepancy for determining eligibility which includes criteria for a process based on a child's response to scientific, research-based intervention. ECD heard from stakeholders about specific language in the policy that was ripe for misinterpretation (e.g., language concerning threshold for "research-based" intervention, our definition of specific learning disability, and inclusion of language surrounding performance comparisons among culturally and linguistically similar peers).

Autism Policy - following multiple rounds of stakeholder input, NCDPI adopted a revised policy for autism definition and identification (Fall 2019) based on current evidence and taxonomy.

Online Professional Learning (PL) offerings - a large portion of our universal PL offerings were transferred to online platforms to continue access amid pandemic restrictions to gatherings and social distancing.

Communication practices - met weekly with EC Directors Advisory Council from March-July, 2020, to communicate COVID-related policy and funding updates; established a weekly newsletter for LEAs to compile/organize multiple EC updates; conducted parent focus groups and an SWD youth survey.

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**  
(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

SSIP Stakeholders - includes following roles: Student with disability, Parents of SWD, Equity Specialist, Evidence-based instructional practices, Behavior/social-emotional learning, Transition, School engagement /attendance, Check and Connect, Multi-tier System of Support, Parent/family engagement, Data analysis, Program Evaluation, Implementation Science, Leveraging data systems (ECATS), Specially-designed instruction, Standards, Curriculum, Instruction, Extended Content Standards, Low-incidence disability, IDEA law and policy, Fiscal management, Charter schools, Pre-school Pyramid Model, Part C SSIP, Federal programs/School Improvement, EC teacher recruitment and retention, Professional learning adult learning theory, Coaching. All areas of expertise are currently filled except SWD role. Group meets monthly to analyze data, provide feedback on work group deliverables, suggest next steps, and bring concerns/questions.

Directors' Advisory Council (DAC) - represents EC directors/coordinators by region; gather, communicate, and advocate for concerns, questions, and areas needing additional support or professional development; collaborates to plan Regional Director Meetings.

Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children - advises NC State Board of Education (SBE) on unmet needs of SWD and in development/implementation of policies related to coordination of services for SWD. Advises SBE on developing evaluations, reporting data, and developing corrective action plans to address findings in federal monitoring. 25 members - 20 appointees and 5 ex-officio; appointed for 4 -year terms by Governor, President Pro Tem of Senate, Speaker of House, and SBE. Appointees represent SWD as parents, teachers, higher education, public and private schools, business/vocational community, and charter schools. Majority of representatives are persons with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities Adaptive Curriculum Stakeholders group - stakeholders including Institutes of higher education, EC Directors, program specialists, building principals, teachers, parents and NCDPI personnel address barriers for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Through problem-solving analysis, subdivided into work groups to address areas of focus including: Professional Development, Preparation, Leveraging Human Capital, Curriculum, and Community Resources. Work groups provide recommendations to address barriers for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Topical focus groups, town halls, and surveys - conducted based on need for shared data analysis, problem-solving, and strategic planning for new EC Division activities (e.g., development and adoption of 2019 ASD Policy, 2020 SLD policy and School Mental Health policy; COVID impact)

Parent Liaison - employed by EC Division and also a parent of a student with a disability; collaborates with community partners; develops/posts a parent newsletter twice monthly; shares announcements from partner agencies; hosted Family Engagement 5-part webinar series to build local capacity for engaging families, specifically through parent liaison positions and special education advisory councils.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?**

Yes

**If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

SLD Policy - In response to stakeholders concerns about misinterpretation (e.g., language concerning threshold for ‘research-based’ intervention, our definition of specific learning disability, and inclusion of language surrounding performance comparisons among culturally and linguistically similar peers), the policy was amended. ECD released a comprehensive virtual course to support knowledge, skills, and abilities for evidence-based practice for SWSLD.

ASD Policy - In response to stakeholders concerns about some policy wording being overly restrictive and that professional competencies were not well-enough defined, the policy was amended and adopted.

From COVID focus groups we heard these concerns:

Parents - juggling own jobs and supporting SWD in remote learning; challenging for families with multiple children; concerns about lack of inclusion and access to remote instruction; parents need training to be de facto EC teacher/RSP; concerns about achievement/growing gaps; has been a “lost year”; others with good experiences with schools/teachers; EC teams going above and beyond what is expected; Group 4 (Spanish): language barrier on top of all other challenges; concerns over shortage of bilingual EC staff/students not getting needed services

LEAs - some districts had to use disproportionate funding for infrastructure to support remote SDI/RS; unaccounted for SWD/families; teacher heros/resilient students; concerns re: connectivity and family capacity to use tech; parent involvement challenges; challenge of EC staffing and capacity to deliver services; concerns re: compliance; scheduling difficulties with contract providers; dropout and achievement concerns; improved collaboration across stakeholders; meeting basic needs of students and families  
See COVID section above for DPI response to these concerns.

**If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):**

n/a

(2) An analysis of the educational performance of children with disabilities in the State and a summary of disputes under Part 1D of this Chapter.

Educational Performance:

The US Department of Education waived the requirement for educational performance data for SY2019-20. The performance data for SY2020-21 is included in

<http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2017/Bills/Senate/PDF/S257v9.pdf>

\*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Disputes:

Special Education State Complaints End of Year Report

The NC Department of Public Instruction manages the state complaint process in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act and accompanying federal regulations, and the *North Carolina Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities*.

<b>2019-20 Special Education State Complaints</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	
Signed written complaints received	119	100%	
<b>Complaints with reports issued</b>			
Complaints with reports issued	87	73%	
• Reports with findings of noncompliance	61	70%	
• Reports with findings of compliance	26	30%	
<b>Reports completed <i>within timeline</i></b>			
Reports completed <i>within timeline</i>	78	90%	<b>93%</b>
Reports completed <i>within extended timeline</i>	3	3%	
Reports that were <i>not completed within timeline(s)</i>	6 <sup>i</sup>	7%	
<b>Complaints found insufficient for investigation</b>			
Complaints found insufficient for investigation	16	13%	
<b>Complaints withdrawn</b>			
Complaints withdrawn	16	13%	
<b>Complaints pending due process hearing/set aside</b>			
Complaints pending due process hearing/set aside	0	0%	
<b>Complaints not issued yet</b>			
Complaints not issued yet	0	0%	

<sup>(i)</sup> Complaints not completed within timeline occurred during the statewide closure of school buildings as a result of COVID-19 and the Governor’s Executive Orders in effect between March 16, 2020, and June 30, 2020. Circumstances were further complicated by the teleworking of NCDPI staff and accessibility to school staff for the purposes of the investigation.

(3) Development and implementation of any policies related to improving outcomes for elementary and secondary school students with disabilities, including any changes related to the directives set forth in Section 8.30 of S.L. 2015-241 as follows:

a. Reforms related to IEP requirements.

No additional policies have been developed.

b. Transition services for students with disabilities from elementary to middle school, middle to high school, and high school to postsecondary education, and for employment opportunities and adult living options.

No additional policies have been developed.

\*Refer to SPP/APR Measure and Language for Future Ready Core Course of Study for students with disabilities, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

No additional policies have been developed.

d. Model programs for use by local school administrative units to improve graduation rates and school performance of students with disabilities.

See information in the SSIP report under (1)