

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

FOR
NORTH CAROLINA
2011

Deborah Carroll, Ph. D., Early Intervention Branch Head
Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Public Health
Women's and Children's Health Section
Early Intervention Branch
1916 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1916
(919) 707-5520

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the APR Development:

North Carolina's early intervention program is organizationally located in the North Carolina (NC) Department of Health and Human Services, in the Division of Public Health. The Early Intervention Branch within the Women's and Children's Health Section of the Division of Public Health manages the program on a statewide level. The Early Intervention Branch's eighteen (17) employed and contracted Children's Developmental Services Agencies (CDSAs) administer the program on a local level.

In preparation for developing a revised APR, the NC Early Intervention Branch Central Office reviewed the most recent state APR (FFY 2010), recent monitoring data, and the OSEP Determination Report for FFY 2010.

The NC EI Program continues to value and obtain broad input from several different stakeholder groups on a continuing basis. For this APR, the NC Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) served as the primary advisory board and provided feedback at a meeting held in October 2102.

The NC EI Program has been engaging in a process focused on results, specifically a focus on Family Outcomes (Indicator 4a), increasing the percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention have helped their family know their rights. This effort was initiated as a result of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process in 2011. An update on the status and progress of the NC EI Program's capacity building plan is included in Indicator 4.

The NC EI Program will disseminate the Annual Performance Report to stakeholders through the local lead agencies and post it on the program's website (www.beeearly.nc.gov/publications).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

97.85% (n = 820)

Actual Target Data for FY 2011: Seven hundred forty six (746) children received their services in a timely manner. Seventy four (74) children did not receive their services in a timely manner due to documented exceptional family circumstances. Two percent (n = 18) of children did not receive all their services in a timely manner due to CDSA specific delays. Therefore, services for eight hundred twenty (820) out of eight hundred thirty eight (838) children (97.85%) met the timely services indicator.

CDSA	2011
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham^	83.33%
Elizabeth City^	95.00%
Fayetteville^	95.35%
Greensboro	100%
Greenville	100%
Morganton	100%
New Bern	90.00%
Raleigh^	95.00%
Rocky Mount^	97.78%
Sandhills^	98.18%
Shelby	100%
Western NC	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	100%
Totals	97.85%

Compliance by the CDSAs in meeting the timely services compliance indicator was determined via a self-assessment record review of all children who had services added to their Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) in January 2012. The self-assessment record review included newly referred children and children already enrolled in the program. Eight hundred thirty eight (838) records of children were reviewed for timeliness of initial and subsequent service initiation. Seven hundred forty six (746) received their services in a timely manner. Eight percent (n = 74) of children did not receive all their services in a timely manner due to documented exceptional family circumstances. Two percent (n = 18) of children did not receive all their services in a timely manner due to CDSA specific delays. The reasons for the delays included: delays in evaluation scheduling, delays in referrals to providers, delays in providers initiating services, inadequate follow up and lack of appropriately qualified community-based providers.

Identification of Noncompliance in FFY 2011

Record review data indicate ten (10) CDSAs achieved 100% compliance (including documented family exceptional circumstances). Six (6) CDSAs (denoted in chart with ^) have been issued findings and received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to show correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification (i.e., the date on which the NC EI Program provided written notification to the CDSA of the noncompliance).

During the time of monitoring, one CDSA (New Bern) was still in correction planning from the FFY 2010 self-assessment.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (including exceptional circumstances)	820
b. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	838
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	97.85%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

The NC EI Program experienced slight slippage from 98.68% (FFY 2010) to 97.85% (FFY 2011). Challenges continue to exist in providing services in a timely manner due to the lack of appropriately qualified community-based providers and inefficiencies in local processes that hinder timely service delivery. Improvement activities to address these challenges included: hiring direct service staff at the local Children’s Developmental Services Agency (CDSA) when a community provider is not available, streamlining local processes to initiate timely services, and focused technical assistance.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 98.68%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	2
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Not Applicable

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance or FFY 2010 findings (either timely or subsequent)

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There was one (1) CDSA in corrective action issued in FY 2010. This CDSA received intensive monitoring, technical assistance and support from the EI Branch Central Office to correct the noncompliance within one year of the finding being issued. The EI Branch Central Office staff verified through record reviews that the CDSA: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the NC EI Program.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

The North Carolina EI Program has a system to identify and correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification (i.e., the date on which the NC EI Program provided written notification to the CDSA of the noncompliance). For those CDSAs issued finding(s), the CDSA with assistance from the EI Branch Central Office investigated the underlying reasons that contributed to the noncompliance. The specific regulatory requirements are reviewed with the CDSA. A corrective action process is developed by the CDSA that matches strategies with root causes of the noncompliance. During the corrective action process, the EI Branch Central Office staff monitors the status of the CDSA's progress through record review data and a review of the implemented strategies. Correction of noncompliance is achieved as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The process used to determine correction of noncompliance includes: analysis of progress report information, verification of the correction of child-specific noncompliance and review of updated subsequent data verifying that the timely services requirement is being implemented in accordance with IDEA. The North Carolina EI Program continues to address how to sustain correction of noncompliance in specific areas of the state and improvements regarding the implementation of local procedures for timely service initiation.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

1. Number of remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2012, FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

Not Applicable

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2008 or Earlier (if applicable):

Not Applicable

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
Not Applicable	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

The State will continue to receive technical assistance through the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Mid-South Regional Resource Center (Mid-South) to continue to serve children and families by ensuring equal access and availability to all children and families to high quality EI services.

Identification of Related Requirements Noncompliance:

As a result of the FFY 2011 self-assessment related requirements monitoring, six (6) CDSAs were issued a finding for noncompliance related to consent to disclosure of information.

These CDSAs received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to show correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification (i.e., the date on which the NC EI Program provided written notification to the CDSA of the noncompliance).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	98%

Actual Target Data for 2011-2012: 10,006 ÷ 10,163 = 98.5%

Actual Target Data is gathered from North Carolina’s statewide Health Information System (HIS) database.

CDSA	Dec 1, 2011 Head Count	Number of children receiving services at home or in other natural environments	Percent of children receiving services at home or in other natural environments
Blue Ridge	226	224	99.1%
Charlotte	1135	1134	99.9%
Concord	773	770	99.6%
Durham	653	652	99.8%
Elizabeth City	189	187	98.9%
Fayetteville	671	633	94.3%
Greensboro	839	827	98.6%
Greenville	556	553	99.5%
Morganton	339	339	100.0%
New Bern	376	376	100.0%
Raleigh	1165	1161	99.7%
Rocky Mount	564	564	100.0%
Sandhills	434	410	94.5%
Shelby	529	517	97.7%
Western NC	607	557	91.8%
Wilmington	363	362	99.7%
Winston-Salem	744	740	99.5%
North Carolina	10,163	10,006	98.5%

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-2012:

Target Met

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-2012:

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2009-2010 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

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

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2011	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> Outcome A: 73.5% Outcome B: 80.0% Outcome C: 78.0%	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> Outcome A: 59.6% Outcome B: 51.1% Outcome C: 57.8%

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The process for implementing child outcomes measurement within North Carolina is on target and is consistent with activities outlined in the State Performance Plan. By the end of June 2007, North Carolina’s EI Program completed the process of phasing in all CDSAs for reporting on the child outcomes indicator. By November 2007, all 18 CDSAs were in the routine cycle of reporting entry and exit data to the EI Branch Central Office. North Carolina is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) as the measurement tool. Per ECO’s website, there are numerous assessment tools that States use to inform child outcomes ratings. Because a standard tool across CDSAs is not required, North Carolina uses a variety of assessment procedures to inform the child’s IFSP team of the rating in each of the three outcome areas. Assessment procedures may include, but are not limited to observations, interviews, play assessments, developmental scales, criterion-referenced and norm-referenced instruments. Because all CDSAs actively collect and report child outcomes data, the data is used to inform the process of child outcome target setting and program improvement strategies.

Specifically, all children enrolled in early intervention for a minimum of six months receive an entry and exit measurement of their developmental status when compared with same-aged peers.¹ The three areas of development are positive social-emotional skills, acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate action to meet needs. The measurement of these behaviors and skills is completed by reviewing all available information compiled through developmental evaluation, observation, input of caregivers, and interviews with parents of the child.

The process in NC is embedded in the on-going delivery of early intervention services as outlined in the child’s IFSP. The initial rating in each area is assigned as the child enters services when the IFSP is signed. An exit rating is determined at one of two junctures: no more than 30 days prior to the child’s third birthday and transition from early intervention services or at exit from the program. Child outcome data from the CDSAs are uploaded monthly to the state-approved database. Monthly data cleaning activities are conducted and include audits for “impossible” rating combinations and missing data elements.

¹Note: Because NC uses the ECO COSF measurement tool, “compared with same-aged peers” refers to the assignment of a score of 6 (Child’s functioning generally is considered appropriate for his or her age but there are some significant concerns about the child’s functioning in this outcome area. These concerns may be substantial enough to suggest monitoring or possible additional support.) or 7 (Child shows functioning expected for his or her age in all or almost all everyday situations that are part of the child’s life. Functioning is considered appropriate for his or her age.) on the rating scale to measure developmental status.

The table below shows the required actual numbers (see pg.4) with the required measurement calculations:

Actual Target Data for 2011:

Targets and Actual Data for Part C Children Exiting in FFY 2011

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2011 (Percent of children)	Actual FFY 2011 (Percent and number of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	73.5%	69.2%= [[1184+2113]/ (25+1444+ 1184+2113)] x 100
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	59.6%	59.9%= [[2113+1856]/ (25+1444+ 1184+2113+ 1856)] x 100
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. 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 exited the program	80.0%	77.4%= [[1911+2676]/ (15+1325+ 1911+2676)] x 100
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	51.1%	50.9%= [[2676+695]/ (15+1325+ 1911+2676+ 695)] x 100
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. 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 exited the program	78.0%	75.5%= [[1393+2803]/ (19+1344+ 1393+2803)] x 100
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	57.8%	58.4%= [[2803+1063]/ (19+1344+ 1393+2803+ 1063)] x 100

Progress Data for FFY 2011

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	25	0.4%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1444	21.8%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1184	17.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2113	31.9%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1856	28.0%
Total	N= 6622	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	15	0.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1325	20.0%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1911	28.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2676	40.4%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	695	10.5%
Total	N= 6622	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	19	0.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1344	20.3%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1393	21.0%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2803	42.3%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1063	16.1%
Total	N= 6622	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Data from FFY 2011 child outcomes indicate that statewide targets for Summary Statement 1 were consistently not met across all three outcome areas while Summary Statement 2 targets were met in the areas of (A) Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) and (C) Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs; however, in the area of (B) Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication), the target for Summary Statement 2 was not met.

Statewide efforts continue to focus on maintaining and improving the capacity to collect and report consistent, reliable data.

During FFY 2011 the NC EI Program has worked on creating a seamless process for IFSP development and reporting child outcomes. The benefit of integrating these two processes is two-fold: facilitate a more direct approach to capture information about child outcomes for children enrolled in the NC EI Program and eliminate duplicative work for EI Program staff.

In addition, the NC EI Program continues to participate in the ENHANCE Project. This project is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and looks at the quality of child outcomes data collected with the COSF. Through this project, state data studies are being conducted over a four year period. These studies will investigate local processes, examine statewide data, explore patterns, and provide insight into how to promote data quality.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

Data continues to increase in reliability and show stability in that the data this FFY are similar to the data reported in the previous FFY. The data for outcomes A and C are also close to the national average. Over the next FFY there are plans to assist local programs with analyzing their own data to assist with making needed improvements.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	a) know their rights: 90% b) effectively communicate their children's needs: 86% c) help their children develop and learn: 91%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

For FFY 2011, all families of children receiving services for at least six months in the NC EI Program were mailed the *NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention*. The *NCSEAM Family Survey* is designed to yield reliable, valid and useful measures of families' perceptions and involvement in early intervention. It is specifically intended to measure the outcome areas required by OSEP. For assistance in distributing surveys and analyzing results of returned surveys, NC contracted with University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Family Support Network (UNC-FSN). UNC-FSN sub-contracted with the Jackson Group for the distribution and the collection of the survey. The Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill analyzed the results and prepared the report.

Each survey mailed contained a cover letter and a postage-paid envelope for returning the completed survey. A total of 5,197 surveys were mailed by the Jackson Group using a client address file provided by the North Carolina EI Branch Central Office. From the initial mailing, 298 surveys (5.7%) were returned due to undeliverable addresses. The number of undeliverable surveys (n=298) was removed from the

denominator to calculate the response rate. The total number of surveys mailed and delivered was 4,899 which represents the December 1, 2011 headcount (10,163) minus children who had not been enrolled at least six months (4,966) and minus the undeliverable (298) surveys.

Survey Results

The *NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention* includes one demographic item (child’s age at the time he/she was referred for early intervention services) and 47 rating scale items divided into two groups: “Family-Centered Services” and “Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family.”

Of the 4,899 surveys, 820 surveys were returned. The effective response rate was approximately 16.7%. An analysis of the responses to the survey’s *Impact of Early Intervention (EI) Services on Families* scale is used for reporting the State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c. The data meet or exceed the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) 2005 National Item Validation Study’s standards for the internal consistency, completeness, and overall quality.

Survey Data by Race/Ethnicity

Data	Source	N	Am Ind.	Asian/Pacf. Is	Black	Hispanic	White	Other
December 1, 2011 Headcount	12/1/11 data	10163	124 (1%)	166 (2%)	2781 (27%)	1816 (18%)	5044 (50%)	232 (2%)
Target Group	Total surveys distributed	4899	72 (1.5%)	92 (1.9%)	1370 (28%)	269 (5.5%)	3080 (62.9%)	16 (0.3%)
Respondent Pool	Total surveys returned	820	11 (1.3%)	19 (2.3%)	150 (18.3%)	45 (5.5%)	595 (72.6%)	0 (0%)

Survey Data by Gender and Language

Data	Source	N	Male	Female	English	Spanish
Target Group	Total surveys distributed	4899	3029 (61.8%)	1870 (38.2%)	4310 (88.0%)	589 (12.0%)
Respondent Pool	Total surveys returned	820	525 (64.0%)	295 (36.0%)	743 (90.6%)	77 (9.4%)

Representativeness of Data

For ethnicity, the largest differential in responses is between White/Caucasian families (who were over-represented in the sample by 9.7 percentage points) and Black/African American (who were under-represented in the sample by 9.7 percentage points). Proportions of responses among some other subgroups also differed, although these differences were smaller. For gender, rates of response were comparable for families of girls and boys (15.8% and 17.3%, respectively). For language, rates of response for Spanish speakers are slightly under-represented when compared to English speakers (13.1% as compared to 17.2%).

The following table provides a summary of North Carolina’s target goals and actual survey results for FFY 2011.

Indicator	FFY 2011 NCSEAM Survey	Target Goals FFY 2011	Actual Results FFY 2011
4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family to:	NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention		
a) know their rights;	a) 76.2%= 625 of 820 families <i>Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family know about my child’s and family’s rights concerning Early Intervention services.</i>	a) 90%	a) 76.2%
b) effectively communicate their children’s needs; and	b) 74.3%= 609 of 820 families <i>Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and family.</i>	b) 86%	b) 74.3%
c) help their children develop and learn	c) 82.8%= 679 of 820 families <i>Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family understand my child’s special needs.</i>	c) 91%	c) 82.8%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

The NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention Survey analysis of the responses to the survey’s Impact of Early Intervention (EI) Services on Families scale includes responses rated “strongly agree” or “very strongly agree”.

NC Results Focus

The NC EI Program has undertaken a results focus process as part of OSEP’s continuous improvement monitoring process. This process has included input from stake holder groups including:

- Early Intervention Branch Central Office staff,

- CDSA staff,
- External stakeholder representatives- the Exceptional Children's Assistance Center (ECAC), NC's Parent Training and Information Center, and professional and family representatives from the North Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), as well as input from
- Technical assistance providers - staff from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO), the Alliance for Systems Change/Mid-South Regional Resource Center (Mid-South RRC) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC).

To select an area of focus, stakeholders held a series of meetings and chose Family Outcomes (Indicator 4a). This focus area was identified as a priority due to the need to identify improvement activities to meet NC's target of 90% and the acknowledgement that improvement of survey responses (data collection) had been the focus of improvement activities.

Ongoing engagement before, during, and after the onsite meeting has resulted in the following state-wide capacity building plan. The plan includes multiple goals and actions, and can be accessed at www.beearly.nc.gov.

A state Family Outcomes Results Steering Committee that will monitor the results plan activities and benchmarks (Goal 1, Action 1) has been established and includes representation from Central Office staff, the ICC, CDSA directors, external stakeholders, and technical assistance providers. The Steering Committee will engage in annual face-to-face meetings and quarterly webinars through June 2014.

The DAC data analytics pilot to evaluate and address quality practices that have a direct impact on families knowing their rights (Goal 2) is nearing completion. Each of the six pilot sites has an implementation plan and the steering committee will address state procedural and practice issues that arose in the DAC local pilot process (Goal 1, Action 2) and incorporate the local DAC pilot findings into statewide planning (Goal 1, Action 3.)

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

There was a slight decrease in the return rate of surveys (16.7%). The ratings given by families for 4c (help their children develop and learn) decreased slightly whereas the ratings given by families for 4a (know their rights) and 4b (effectively communicate their children's needs) increased slightly. Data suggest improvements are needed to address areas such as improving survey response rates and representativeness of responses, and targeted activities for improving practices for some of the CDSAs. The Family Outcomes Steering Committee, as mentioned above, is focused on this results indicator and is developing strategies to address these challenges as mentioned above.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

The Family Outcomes Results Steering Committee will monitor the state-wide capacity building plan activities and benchmarks and will implement work groups to address statewide capacity, materials development including a review of all NC family rights materials and researching materials from other states, and training and technical assistance including state-wide and CDSA-specific training needs.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	1.10%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: There were 1,364 children aged birth to one year enrolled on December 1, 2011. On December 1, 2011, the state population for this age group was 121,983. The actual percentage of children aged birth to 1 year is **1.12%**. NC met the target and surpassed the National percentage.

CDSA	Children Aged Birth to One	Population Aged Birth to One	Percent of Population Aged Birth to One
Blue Ridge	22	1854	1.19%
Charlotte	178	14053	1.27%
Concord	101	8936	1.13%
Durham	74	8702	0.85%
Elizabeth City	12	2053	0.58%
Fayetteville	67	9033	0.74%
Greensboro	90	10611	0.85%
Greenville	92	5094	1.81%
Morganton	48	4356	1.10%
New Bern	36	7225	0.50%
Raleigh	143	12694	1.13%
Rocky Mount	84	6024	1.39%
Sandhills	66	6054	1.09%
Shelby	77	5386	1.43%
Western NC	87	6019	1.45%
Wilmington	54	5402	1.00%
Winston-Salem	133	8487	1.57%
North Carolina (US Census Bureau data)	1364	121983	1.12%

This table provides the birth to one year of age data for the CDSAs. The table also shows the statewide percentage of children enrolled in early intervention services as compared to the same-age population.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Target Met

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	2.00%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: There were 10,163 children aged birth to three years enrolled on December 1, 2011. On December 1, 2011, the state population for this group was 371,890. The actual percentage is **2.73%**.

CDSA	Children Aged Birth to Three	Population Aged Birth to Three	Percent of Population Aged Birth to Three
Blue Ridge	226	5723	3.95%
Charlotte	1135	42072	2.70%
Concord	773	28023	2.76%
Durham	653	26660	2.45%
Elizabeth City	189	6341	2.98%
Fayetteville	671	26523	2.53%
Greensboro	839	32510	2.58%
Greenville	556	15793	3.52%
Morganton	339	13599	2.49%
New Bern	376	20633	1.82%
Raleigh	1165	38496	3.03%
Rocky Mount	564	18802	3.00%
Sandhills	434	18975	2.29%
Shelby	529	16549	3.20%
Western NC	607	18255	3.33%
Wilmington	363	16575	2.19%
Winston-Salem	744	26361	2.82%
North Carolina (US Census Bureau data)	10163	371890	2.73%

This table provides the birth to three year of age data for CDSAs. The table also shows the statewide percentage of children enrolled in early intervention services as compared to the same-age population.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Target Met

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

99.39% (n = 654)

Compliance by the CDSAs in meeting the 45-day timeline indicator was determined via a self-assessment record review of all children referred to the program between November 17, 2011 – December 17, 2011 or children with IFSP due dates in January 2012. During FFY 2011, the EI Branch Central Office provided each CDSA with a list of children (extracted from the state's database) who were referred November 17, 2011 – December 17, 2011, for whom IFSPs were due in 2012. The record review process is used to determine compliance or noncompliance including an account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the specific reasons for delays.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: Data on six hundred fifty-eight (658) children were examined to verify the 45-day timeline for compliance. Five hundred seventy-seven (577) children received an IFSP within 45 days of referral. Seventy-seven (77) children did not receive an IFSP in a timely manner due to documented exceptional family circumstances. Therefore, the records of six hundred fifty-four (654) out of six hundred fifty-eight (658) children (99.39%) met the 45-day timeline indicator. This figure represents slight slippage of 0.38% from the FFY 2010 figure of 99.77%.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Infants Evaluated and Assessed and provided an Initial IFSP meeting Within Part C’s 45-day timeline:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline (including exceptional circumstances)	654
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	658
Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	99.39%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

In FFY 2011, of the six hundred fifty-eight (658) children whose records were reviewed, approximately 88% (n = 577) of children received an IFSP within 45 days of referral. Eleven percent (n = 77) showed delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. Less than one percent (n = 4) of children did not receive an IFSP within 45 days of referral. Each CDSA submitted reasons why any child did not receive an IFSP within 45 days. The reasons for the CDSA delays were due to delays in evaluation and IFSP scheduling, and inadequate follow-up. The next table shows CDSA-specific data.

January 2012 CDSA	Compliance
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham^	95.35%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	100%
Greensboro	100%
Greenville	100%
Morganton	100%
New Bern^	95.83%
Raleigh	100%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills^	97.62%
Shelby	100%
Western NC	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	100%
Totals	99.39%

Identification of Noncompliance in FFY 2011

Record review data indicate fourteen (14) CDSAs achieved 100% compliance (including documented exceptional family circumstances). Three (3) CDSAs (denoted in chart with ^) have been issued a finding(s) and received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification (i.e., the date on which the NC EI Program provided written notification to the CDSA of the noncompliance).

The slight slippage from 99.77% to 99.39% can be attributed to delays in evaluation scheduling or inadequate follow-up.

Related Requirements:

As a result of FFY 2011 focused monitoring and other monitoring activities, seven (7) CDSAs were issued a total of fourteen (14) findings in the following areas:

- Written Prior Notice 4 findings
- Confidentiality 1 finding
- Written Parental Consent 2 findings
- Timely and Accurate Data 6 findings
- Surrogate Parent 1 finding

The CDSAs received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to show correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification (i.e., the date on which the NC EI Program provided written notification to the CDSA of the noncompliance).

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 99.77%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	0
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Not Applicable

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance or FFY 2010 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

Findings for FFY 2010 were not issued as the state reported essentially 100% compliance. During the time of monitoring, one CDSA (Shelby) was still in correction planning from the FFY 2009 self-assessment and reported compliance of 95.91%. Findings from FFY 2009 were corrected as of April 30, 2011.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s June 2011, FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Remaining FFY 2009 findings

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

Not Applicable

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
Not Applicable	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

CDSAs continue to use their internal quality assurance processes to monitor the 45-day timeline. The EI Branch Central Office staff continue to verify data and ensure that CDSAs maintain compliance. Ongoing monitoring and technical assistance are occurring per the SPP. These ongoing monitoring and technical assistance efforts focus on the identification and correction of any noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from identification.

In FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, based on stakeholder input, the NC EI Program refocused improvement activities. Through an extensive review of the current service delivery system, the NC EI Program determined that there are a number of variations across the state in the following areas:

- Implementation and interpretation of state policies and procedures
- Use of evidence-based practices
- Percentage of children enrolled in the NC EI Program
- Staff roles/responsibilities

These variations may result in inconsistencies in access to and availability of quality services for all children and families. The NC EI Program's revisions to the objective of improving access to appropriately qualified providers have evolved into the implementation of a more consistent state Early Intervention (EI) system that supports access to quality services and supports for children and their families congruent with the principles and requirements of IDEA Part C.

Improvement activities include:

- Common talking points and guidance for initial contacts with families,
- CDSA referral and community outreach strategies for increased community awareness and collaboration,
- Training and guidance in the service definition of evaluation and assessment and the consistent use of five selected instruments in determining eligibility for EI, and
- Revisions to the IFSP form to better incorporate child and family outcomes data.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8A: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A IFSPs with transition steps and services

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Service Plan Includes Transition Steps and Services: 100% (n=574)

Data for IFSPs with transition steps and services are collected via a self-assessment process. CDSAs were provided with a list of records for all children who were 2 years, 9 months of age in January 2012, and should have had a transition plan with steps developed, notification to the LEA, and a transition-planning conference by January 2012 to review as part of the self-assessment process. Reasons for noncompliance were collected when noncompliance was identified.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

CDSA	FFY 2011
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham	100%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	100%
Greensboro	100%
Greenville	100%
Morganton	100%
New Bern	100%
Raleigh	100%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills	100%
Shelby	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	100%
WNC	100%
Total	100%

This table denotes 100% (n=574) compliance in FFY 2011 for children who are transitioning and have IFSPs with transition steps and services.

FFY 2010 data also denoted 100% compliance.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

c. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	574
d. Number of children exiting Part C	574
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

Not Applicable

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 100%

7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	0
8. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
9. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

10. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
11. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
12. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Not Applicable

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

Not Applicable

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

Not Applicable

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

4. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
5. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
6. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings:

Not applicable.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

Not Applicable

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2008 or Earlier (if applicable):

Not Applicable

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
Not Applicable	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8B: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

A Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B;

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Notification to the LEA of children deemed potentially eligible: 99.83% (n=574)

Data are from state monitoring efforts. Data for the notification to LEA, if the child is potentially eligible for Part B, are collected via self-assessment. CDSAs were provided with a list of records for all children who were two (2) years, nine (9) months of age in January 2012, and should have had a transition plan with steps developed, notification to the LEA, and a transition-planning conference by January 2012 to review as part of the self-assessment process. All children who remain enrolled in Part C in NC at the time they are transitioning out of the program at age 3 are potentially eligible for Part B in NC. Reasons for noncompliance were collected when noncompliance was identified.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

CDSA	FFY 2011
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham	100%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville ^	96.00%
Greensboro	100%
Greenville	100%
Morganton	100%
New Bern	100%
Raleigh	100%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills	100%
Shelby	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	100%
WNC	100%
Total	99.83%

Identification of noncompliance in FFY 2011

In FFY 2011, 574 records were reviewed to examine whether the LEA was appropriately notified of potentially eligible children. Sixteen of the CDSAs reported 100% compliance. One (denoted with ^) CDSA was cited with one finding. Corrective actions were developed and implemented to address internal processes for tracking of LEA notification. Correction of noncompliance is to occur within one year from written notification of the finding.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):

e. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	573
f. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	574
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	99.83%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

Not Applicable

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 99.81%

13. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	1
14. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	1
15. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

16. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
17. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
18. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Not Applicable

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

For FFY 2010 strategies to address the findings were identified in the corrective action process, and correction of noncompliance occurred less than one year from notification. EI Branch Central Office staff, together with individual CDSA staff, investigated the underlying reasons that contributed to the noncompliance. The specific regulatory requirements were reviewed. A corrective action process was developed, matching strategies with the root causes of noncompliance. During the corrective action process, EI Branch Central Office staff members monitored the status of progress through the submission of record review data and through a review of the implementation of efficient strategies. For this CDSA, correction of all noncompliance regarding policies and procedures occurred less than one year from the finding being issued. In addition, all child specific noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the NC EI Program. EI Branch Central Office staff analyzed progress report information, held discussions with CDSA management, and verified through subsequent record review on site. Through this process EI Branch Central Office staff verified that this CDSA corrected noncompliance, systematically correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and had provided LEA notification for each child-specific noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CDSA/NC EI Program.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

7. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s June 2011, FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	0
8. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
9. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings:

Not Applicable

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

Not Applicable

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2008 or Earlier (if applicable):

Not Applicable

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
Not Applicable	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8C: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

Transition Planning Conference: 98.78% (n=574)

Data are from state monitoring efforts. Data for the transition conference, if a child is potentially eligible for Part B, are collected via self-assessment. CDSAs were provided a list of records for all children who were two (2) years and nine (9) months of age in January 2012, and should have had a transition plan with steps developed, notification to the LEA, and a transition-planning conference by January 2012 to review as part of the self-assessment process. Reasons for noncompliance were collected when noncompliance was identified.

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

CDSA	FFY 2011
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham^	87.88%
Elizabeth City^	95.24%
Fayetteville^	96.00%
Greensboro	100%
Greenville	100%
Morganton	100%
New Bern	100%
Raleigh	100%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills^	96.15%
Shelby	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	100%
WNC	100%
Total	98.78%

The data shows 98.78% compliance for FFY 2011, which represents improvement as compared to FFY 2010 data of 95.24%.

In FFY 2011, 574 records were reviewed to examine the percentage of children potentially eligible for Part B and whether a timely transition-planning conference was held no later than 90 days before the child's third birthday. Ninety-one percent (520 of 574) records denoted that a conference was held in a timely manner and 8% (47) were not held in a timely manner due to documented exceptional family circumstances or late referral to Part C--defined as a referral received less than 90 days before the third birthday whereas the remaining records (n=7) indicated a CDSA-specific noncompliance.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):

g. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred	567
h. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	574
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Transition Conference) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	98.78%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

Identification of Noncompliance in FFY 2011

The data represent 98.78% performance for FY 2011, which is improvement for Indicator 8C as compared to FFY 2010 data of 95.24%. Thirteen (13) CDSAs reported 100% compliance. Four (4) CDSAs (denoted with ^) were cited with a finding; corrective action plans were developed and implemented. Compliance is to be corrected as soon as possible for all findings but no later than one year from the written notification.

The NC EI Program continues to focus its improvement activities on maintaining compliance regarding effective transition practices. The purpose is to become even more effective in identifying and correcting noncompliance and ensuring system-wide improvement. Strategies involve a variety of activities including collaborating with the Part B 619 program to help ensure children experience a smooth transition from Part C to Part B. A practice document, *Guiding Practices in Transition* was developed for both Part B and Part C personnel in a previous fiscal year. This document was revised to reflect clarification received from OSEP in the December 2009 Transition FAQ document and the September 2011 *Federal Regulations* for Part C. Stakeholder input has been gathered from Part C and Part B staff as part of implementing clarification received from OSEP’s Transition FAQ and assisted in revising the practice document.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 95.24%

19. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	3
20. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	3
21. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

22. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
23. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
24. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Not Applicable

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

There were three CDSAs with a total of three findings in corrective action issued in FFY 2010. These three CDSAs received intensive monitoring. EI Branch Central Office staff, together with individual CDSA staff members, investigated the underlying reasons that contributed to the noncompliance. A corrective action process was developed for each CDSA matching strategies with the root causes of noncompliance. During the corrective action process, EI Branch Central Office staff monitored the status of each CDSA’s progress through the submission of record review data and a review of the implementation of efficient strategies. For these three CDSAs, correction of all noncompliance regarding policies and procedures occurred less than one year from the finding being issued. In addition, all child-specific noncompliance was corrected with transition conferences occurring as soon as possible unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the NC EI Program. EI Branch Central Office staff

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

analyzed the progress report information, held discussions with CDSA management, and verified through subsequent record review on site. Through this process EI Branch Central Office staff verified that these three CDSAs have corrected noncompliance, are systemically correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the CDSA/NC EI Program.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

10. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2011, FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	0
11. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
12. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

Not Applicable

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2008 or Earlier (if applicable):

Not Applicable

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
Not Applicable	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

- Review and revision of the Part C and Part B 619 programs' Interagency Agreement to include the information clarified in OSEP's December 2009 Transition FAQ document and September 2011 Federal Regulations for Part C.
 - *Revisions have been made and are in the approval process.*

- Review and revision of the practice document *Guiding Practices in Transition* to include the information clarified in OSEP's December 2009 Transition FAQ document and September 2011 Federal Regulations for Part C.
 - *Completed – In the interagency approvals process.*
- Collaborate with Part B 619 program in the development of a training video on best practices in transitions as a method to sustain trainings conducted two years ago and including current policy per OSEP's FAQ.
 - *NC Early Childhood Transition Training Module, online training module for both Part C and B staff on best practices in transition; jointly developed along with a task group from the NC Interagency Coordinating Council; completion date delayed to FFY 2012 due to necessary revisions to the module content.*
- Recommend CDSAs to review completed regional plans annually with their respective LEAs on transition to make any needed changes or updates, submit the plans to the responsible state agencies, and implement any changes made to the regional plans.
 - *Transition catchment area plans are completed and will be updated in FY 2012 as needed by each CDSA/LEA team.*

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the “Indicator 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment 1).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

100%

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Written Prior Notice	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Related Requirements re: Service Delivery	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			10	10
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			10 / 10 X 100 =	100.00%

Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:

All CDSAs (local lead agencies) received monitoring activities this year. These monitoring activities included: on-site focused visits, self-assessment data submission/analysis, data verification and/or desk review/data review. CDSAs that are in corrective action planning receive more intensive monitoring and technical assistance and have more data verification and data collection requirements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Indicator 1 – Did not meet target of 100%, but very high levels of compliance are noted. For FFY 2011, North Carolina has reported 95.35% compliance, as compared to 95.98% for FY 2010, showing consistently high performance for this indicator across the two years.

Indicator 2 – Target met: 98.50%

Indicator 3 – Subcomponent targets show mixed results; 2 of 6 targets met. See Indicator for details regarding progress towards improvement activities.

Indicator 4 – Did not meet target. The EI Program selected this Indicator as the “Results” topic as a component of the program’s recent Continuous Improvement Visit with OSEP and other stakeholders. See Indicator for details regarding progress towards improvement activities.

Indicator 5 – Target met: 1.12%

Indicator 6 – Target met: 2.77%

Indicator 7 – Target met: 100%

Indicator 8a – Target met: 100%

Indicator 8b – Did not meet target of 100%, but very high levels of performance are noted. For FY 2011-2012, North Carolina has reported 96% performance as compared to 99.81% in FY 2010-2011. Corrective action measures are being instituted for those local programs that are in need of improvement.

Indicator 8c – Did not meet target of 100%, but very high levels of performance are noted. For FY 2011-2012, North Carolina has reported 96% performance as compared to 95.24% in FY 2010-2011.

Indicator 9 – Target met: 100%

Indicator 10 – Reported in Part C data report; fewer than 10 complaints/due process requests.

Indicator 11 – Reported in Part C data report; fewer than 10 complaints/due process requests.

Indicator 12 – Not applicable to North Carolina as Part C due process procedures are used

Indicator 13 – Target met: 100%

Indicator 14 – Target met: 100%

Timely Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C9 Worksheet)	10
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C9 Worksheet)	10
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (either timely or subsequent)

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken):

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program’s general supervision system continues to function as previously described to OSEP. The program is continuing to implement components of the state’s web-based data system with the goal of using this system for the purposes of monitoring. Currently child record review is the primary method for verifying the correction of noncompliance. The components of annual self-assessment, identification of noncompliance, correction of noncompliance, focused monitoring, data verification and desk audits continue as described in previous annual reports. Systemic noncompliance has been addressed across the state and procedures are in place to identify and correct individual instances of noncompliance.

In FY 2010, there were a total of ten (10) findings of noncompliance identified in eight (8) CDSAs. All findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of identification. The Early Intervention Program verified that each CDSA with findings of noncompliance identified in FY 2010 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated data. This subsequent data was collected through on-site monitoring or desk audits. The Early Intervention Program also verified that each CDSA had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CDSA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

CDSAs are required to complete child record review self-assessments annually. The EI Branch Central office collects self-assessment data at designated points and times each year for indicators 1, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c as these data are not collected in the program’s data system. These data are either collected

based on a month or quarter. In order to continue to improve compliance in timeliness of services (Indicator 1), the Central Office provides each CDSA with the names of all children enrolled in the program who had a new service added to their IFSP (newly enrolled children and children already receiving services) during a given month. In order to maintain compliance with transition indicators (Indicator 8 sub-components), the Central Office provides the CDSAs with the names of all children who should have had a transition planning conference as of a specific date. Data are also collected to assure that: 1) there was a transition plan with steps and services in place; and 2) if a child was potentially eligible for preschool services, the LEA was notified. Data and a data analysis report are submitted by each CDSA to the EI Branch Central office with reasons why any timeline is not being met and any unique data related to specifics regarding each individual child. Data verification occurs by the EI Branch Central office staff through an on-site verification visit.

If a finding is issued, the CDSA receives a written notification of the finding and a written corrective action plan within 30 days. Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) are issued when there is noncompliance and a finding is noted. Corrective action plans include strategies and required evidence of change. These CAPs are written by the EI Branch Central Office staff in collaboration with the CDSAs. Required reporting occurs until noncompliance is corrected. The EI Branch verifies data throughout the CAP process to ensure the local program is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of IDEA, correcting any child specific instances (although late), unless the child is not enrolled in the NC EI Program and that the root cause of noncompliance has been addressed.

The CDSAs have an opportunity to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written notification of a finding. The CDSA must provide updated data that demonstrates 1) CDSA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data and 2) CDSA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The EI Branch Central office staff verifies (through record reviews) that correction has occurred for both of these steps.

Improvement plans may be issued during monitoring activities. Improvement plans are generally related to performance and include measurable benchmarks over time. Improvement plan strategies and activities are written by the CDSA in partnership with or with direct guidance from the Early Intervention Branch Central Office.

Throughout the year, activities are completed by the EI Branch Central Office to verify the reliability, accuracy and timeliness of data reported by the CDSAs. Several methods for data verification are utilized, such as error reports, routine data reports, data reports summarizing contract performance and on-site data verification visits. Point in time data are routinely provided to CDSAs to ensure reliable, valid data for 619 data reporting.

Dispute Resolution System

The North Carolina Infant Toddler Program has revised its dispute resolution system to remove the timeline that was associated with mediation and ensure that any written reports associated with a state complaint contain all the requirements of Part C of IDEA.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	Not Applicable

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Not applicable to North Carolina as Part C due procedures are used.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

Not applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

The lead agency received one (1) request for mediation near the end of FFY 2011. This mediation occurred in FY 2012-2013.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Not Applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

Not Applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the “Indicator 14 Data Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

EI Branch Central Office staff reviewed the results of the self-assessment data submitted to the state office for compliance indicators. Each CDSA was contacted if any clarification was needed on the reported results. This ensured that the data were reported accurately and consistently across CDSAs.

EI Branch Central Office staff worked with CDSA staff to ensure that data in the Health Information System (HIS), the database used for 618 reporting, were kept accurate through periodic data-cleaning activities. Focused technical assistance was provided as needed.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Development has continued on the Health Information System (HIS), implemented in the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services as of July 1, 2010. During FFY 2011 CDSAs have increased their use of HIS, with additional data fields. HIS is used for reporting 618 data, as well as data for the compliance indicators in the APR.

Information from HIS is downloaded daily into the Client Services Data Warehouse (CSDW). The CSDW allows users to generate reports from the HIS data based on criteria the user selects. Programmatic data, including referral and exit information, became available in the CSDW during FFY 2011. This allowed for the creation of reports in CSDW that can identify potential data entry errors in the 618 data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2012:

During FFY 2012 additional report queries will be developed to audit data entry errors and to improve overall data integrity by CDSAs. Beginning FFY 2012, CDSA staff will be entering Child Outcomes data and service data into HIS. Staff at the local CDSAs will continue to receive training and technical assistance on how to use queries generated at the EI Central Office, as well as on how to modify existing queries.

The EI Branch Central Office will review and respond to OSEP's calculation for this indicator.