

Continuous Improvement Performance Plan (CIPP) 2011

LEA Name: CAPE FEAR CENTER FOR INQUIRY

LEA Number: 65A

Superintendent: BRIAN CORRIGAN, Director

Exceptional Children Director: NANCY G. JOHNSEN

Submitted by: NANCY G. JOHNSEN

Date of Submission: JUNE 29, 2011

Stakeholders Steering Committee Summary

1. **List dates of the Stakeholders Steering Committee Meetings for the 2010-2011 school year.**

November 9, 2010

March 15, 2011

June 27, 2011 – email communication for final CIPP activities approval

Explain/Describe the Stakeholders Steering Committee’s process for sharing the LEA data with the following: CFCI has a regular method of meeting that includes administrators, faculty, parents and the Board of Directors. Dissemination of information was determined to be provided through these already established dates and times. Specific dates are noted below.

A. Teachers

Faculty Meetings held weekly; Wednesday at 3:30 PM

When: specific agenda items dealing with EC issues shared on 09/01/2010, 02/09/2011

How: Faculty Meeting presentations, announcements and discussion followed with emailed minutes

B. Administrators

Admin Team Meetings scheduled weekly; Wednesday at 10:30 AM

When: 2010: 8/16,18; 9/15; 10/6,13; 11/3,17; 12/3,8 **2011:** 1/5,12,28; 2/2,9,16,25; 3/16,29,30; 4/6,13,26; 5/10,18; 6/1

How: EC Coordinator’s report to other administrators followed with emailed minutes

C. School Board

When: Meetings held monthly; 3rd Tuesday at 7:00 PM

How: Specific presentation via power point on 12/14/2010

Regular information provided via Director’s Reports

D. Parents

When: Partnership Meetings/ usually held bi-monthly at 6:30 PM

How: Disability Awareness table with literature and EC Coordinator available to field questions

What: New Parent Information Meetings – selected days and times

When: Sat. 1/8 @ 10 AM, Tues. 1/11 @ 6 PM, Thurs. 1/20 @ 6:30 PM, Wed. 1/26 @ 4:30 PM

How: EC Coordinator’s slide/oral presentation and provision of an EC services brochure

E. Others Charter schools receive continuous inquiries as to the services we provide and the accommodations we have in place for serving students with disabilities. It has been the determination of this school’s team to route all inquires (phone, email, in person contacts) of this nature through the EC Coordinator. In addition, CIPP activities and an EC information link are available on the school’s website.

2. **Keep agendas, minutes, calendars, sign in sheets, etc. for meetings with CIPP documentation for review at verification visits.**

Stakeholders Steering Committee Summary

The recommended Stakeholders Steering Committee members:

- **EC Director (or designee)**
- **Building Administrator**
- **Parent of a SWD**
- **EC Preschool Representative, if applicable**
- **EC Teacher**
- **General Education Teacher**
- **SWD age 14 or older (younger is at the discretion of the LEA)**
- **Business/Agency/Community Leader or a leader from an organization that provides transition services/experiences**
- **Other(s) at the discretion of the LEA**

The committee membership should reflect the demographics of the LEA, particularly the Exceptional Children Population.

2011-12 Committee Composition				
Committee Member Name	Organization/Agency	Role on the Committee	Gender	Ethnicity
Nancy Johnsen	LEA	EC Director	F	W
Brian Corrigan	LEA	Building Administrator	M	W
Evelyn Albright	LEA	EC Teacher	F	W
Joanne Brinkley	LEA	GE/Kindergarten Teacher	F	W
Pauline Piner	LEA	EC Teacher/Reading Specialist	F	W
Kirk Martells		Parent	M	B
Dr. Susan Catapanos	UNCW Faculty	Business/Agency Community Leader	F	W
	LEA	Student	F	B
	LEA	Student	M	W
Lori Benazzi	LEA	EC Teacher/Behavioral Specialist	F	W
Heather Kelejian	County Arboretum/ Horticultural Therapist	Business/Agency Community Leader/Parent	F	W
Nancy Kachadurian	LEA	GE 4-5 Teacher	F	W

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of students with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma

Measurement: Four year Cohort Graduation Rate for students entering 9th grade in 2006-07 for the first time is the rate for students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma in 2009-10 or earlier.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	80% or more of students with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

X This charter school does not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)

NOTE: All LEAs serving grades represented within this indicator must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address students with IEP's graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

1. LEA met State Target? _____ Yes _____ No

2. If the target was not met, complete the following:

A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.

B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.

C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 2: Percent of students with IEPs dropping out of high school**

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

The definition for dropout 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 of 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, as reported in North Carolina's Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) Part I, December 17, 2010.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	5.5% or less is the dropout rate for students with IEPs in grades 9-12.

X **This charter school does not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)**

NOTE: All LEAs serving grades represented within this indicator must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address dropping out of high school.

1. LEA met State Target? Yes No
2. If the target was not met, complete the following:
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.
 - B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.
 - C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 3: Participation and performance of students with IEPs on statewide assessments:**

- A. LEA met the State AYP objectives (reading and math) for progress for the disability subgroup
- B. Participation rate for students with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for students with IEPs

Measurement:

- A. LEA met the State's AYP objectives (reading and math) for progress for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate equals the number of students with IEPs in grades assessed divided by the number of students with IEPs in that grade, times 100.
- C. Proficiency rate equals the number of students with IEPs, scoring level 3 or above in grade assessed, divided by the number of students with IEPs assessed in that grade, times 100.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Targets
2009-10	<p>A. 55% of LEAs met AYP</p> <p>B. Percentage of Participation: 95 for reading & math in all tested grade levels</p> <p>C. Percentage of Proficiency:</p> <p><u>Reading</u>: 3rd through 8th grade = 43.2 10th = 38.5 <u>Math</u>: 3rd through 8th grade = 77.2 10th = 68.4</p>

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address students' with IEPs participation and proficiency rates.

1. LEA made AYP for students with disabilities? Yes No NA
n/a – less than 40 students in this subgroup
2. LEA met all state targets for participation and proficiency? Yes No
3. If the target was not met, complete the following for each target NOT met:
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target(s) for 2009-10 school year.

With a total LEA/school population for grades 3 – 8 being no more than a possible 260 students and within that population having less than 40 total number of students with disabilities (SWD) across these 6 grade levels, analysis of the proficiency data can be subject to significant change based on the scores of just one or two students. Consistently CFCI continues to test 100% of all their students and when looking at the reading and math proficiency scores for intended growth, tracking the same children from year to year, when we have enough students to give us data, may give us a clearer picture of actual student academic growth or the lack thereof. When comparing the data between 2009-10 and 2008-09, only the 4th, 5th and 2009-10 6th grades had enough students tested to be able to report actual percentages. In three cases, student performance increased ranging from seven percentage points between 5th to 6th grade reading to 33.3 percentage points from 4th to 5th grade math. These are clear indicators of academic growth for our students with disabilities. Only in one case did the scores drop and that was by 2.8 percentage points from 5th to 6th grade in math.

For our overall instructional purposes, however, the most telling data seems to come from analyzing the proficiency data of CFCI's SWD compared with CFCI's non-disabled student population. Half of the grades scores for their non-disabled students indicate that 89% or more of these students were at or above proficiency with the 4th and 5th graders scoring 94.9% and >95% respectively. Five out of the six grades demonstrated that 93% or more of the non-disabled students were performing at or above proficiency in math and the 4th, 7th and 8th graders scored >95%.

B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.

In light of the above information and when looking at the instructional model of the school, which is inquiry, we as a team are forced to evaluate whether our intervention direction (activities) has matched what the data is showing and whether the manner of documenting those interventions and the ultimate growth of our SWD could be better served with a different emphasis.

When evaluating last year's activities supporting indicator #3c for reading, continuing the use of DIBELS (activities #1,2) to collect universal school-wide data will be discontinued. Despite all the teacher training and resources provided, in answering the CIPP Review Checklist questions honestly, we could not overlook the 'LEA priorities' noted in question three. With the regular education priority being 'inquiry' which feeds right into a whole language, natural progressive and developmental philosophy, finite skill and specific data collection is not supported by these teachers. They assess, but they assess in their own way and are not open to changing their methods. Question #5 asks if the improvement activity is realistic. We have tried implementing the use of DIBELS for two years and have come to the conclusion that what "can" be done isn't always "done" with fidelity and if the climate does not buy-in to the purpose or validity of a method then the time and resources spent are wasted. In a school that values teacher autonomy, any method of standardization across grade levels is not accepted. So in the end, how well the students perform must be the key evaluative factor and there is no questioning that the non-disabled student population at CFCI performs very well!

For math the same is true. This past year all teachers were trained in and provided resource manuals with pages and pages of CBM probes for reading and for math. This was intended to help them develop interventions and have progress monitoring materials available for use to make their job of tracking student academic growth easier. Again, this was met with minimal general educator support. They liked having these materials but did not tend to use them throughout the year except in those rare incidents for struggling students in the RtI process. For this reason coupled with EOG data and based on the same philosophy as stated for the reading interventions above, implementation of last year's math activities #5, 6 supports the decision to discontinue these interventions school-wide.

In the literature for parents developed by the CFCI EC department regarding students with disabilities, three questions are posed for parents to answer when considering whether to bring their children to this charter school of choice. They are:

1. What type of instruction best supports my child's individual learning style?
2. Does my child perform better in an environment with a greater amount of structure or less structure?
3. Is my child an independent learner who works well with their peers or does he/she need a significant amount of adult direct instructional support?

Additionally the literature states, “CFCI was founded on the belief that children can learn best through the inquiry model. The regular classes are non-traditional and use exploration as their primary method for learning. This requires that students are able to demonstrate independence, including self-help skills for the younger children, are eager to learn and work well with others.”

These student characteristics are fostered in an environment that puts a strong emphasis on the social curriculum “Teaching Children to Care.” The day for all students is structured around collaboration and exploration. Our data is reflecting a general school-wide population that performs consistently higher than our surrounding districts. With this knowledge, our team in evaluating last year’s activities has come to an interesting conclusion.

To better support our SWD, what becomes clear is the need to continue two specific directions:

1. Early prevention activities targeting K – 2nd grades. This is always appropriate and will be continued.
2. Stepping up the specially designed instruction for students already identified as SWD and measuring growth through progress monitoring along anticipated trajectory measures.

For example a reading goal may state: *Using pre and post CBM probes administered monthly with an anticipated improvement of 30 % over assessed baseline within the IEP period and using word patterns, root words, prefixes and suffixes, Johnny will increase his basic reading skills by increasing vocabulary and sight word knowledge .*

By using this type of method to track student progress, teachers can determine whether the instruction is supporting anticipated student growth. This year one specific 4th grader was not responding to the Orton-Gillingham method of reading instruction that the majority of our SLD students receiving reading instruction respond to and the decision was made to order *SRA Corrective Reading B1* for him. Since this curriculum change he has begun to make slow but steady progress. A Wilson Language curriculum, *Foundations*, has been started with two first graders and, again, slow but steady progress is now recorded.

C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity. 2011 - 2012

Activity #1:

- June 13: DIAL-3 screenings
- August: Follow-up on all kindergarten communication concerns by Speech Pathologist
- Aug – May: Interventions as needed; referrals as needed; placements as needed

Activity #2:

- 2011-2012: With the EC Coordinators approval, whole group kindergarten and first grade 30 minutes weekly sessions to be provided by the occupational therapist to target students fine motor skills

Activities #3-5; 7-9; 15 and 18:

- August 9, 15: New staff orientation presented by Curriculum Coordinator, EC Coordinator, selected staff members
- August 16: Faculty staff development presented by Administrative Team and selected staff members

Activity #6:

- April-May: Letter to parents regarding EOG testing; posting on website; teacher newsletters

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 4: Rates of suspensions and Expulsions**

- A. LEAs with rates of suspension and expulsions of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in the school year that is greater than twice the state average rate
- B. LEAs with rates of suspensions and expulsions by race/ethnicity of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in the school year that is greater than twice the state average rate.

Measurement:

- A. LEA data indicate a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in the school year.
- B. LEA data indicate a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in the school year; and 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.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. LEA rate of suspensions and expulsion of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in a school year that is greater than twice the state average rate (<4.3%) B. LEA rate of suspensions and expulsions, by race/ethnicity of SWD for greater than 10 consecutive days in a school year that is greater than twice the state average rate (<4.3%); or if the LEA rate indicates a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity (>= 4.3%) the LEA's policies, procedures or practices do not contribute to the significant discrepancy and comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address decreasing suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities for both components of this indicator.

1. LEA met State Target A? Yes No
2. LEA met State Target B? Yes No
3. For each target not met, complete the following:
 - A. LEA must review data (areas of disability, reasons for, and in which grades and schools of SWD who are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 consecutive days for 2009-10 school year). Summarize the results of this review.
 - B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.
 - C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity

Activity #15:

2011-2012- Implement behavioral interventions as needed to maintain school attendance.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 who are served in:

- A. Regular setting – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day**
- B. Separate setting – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day and**
- C. Separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements**

Measurement:

- A. Percent = the number of students with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100**
- B. Percent = the number of students with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day divided the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100**
- C. Percent = the number of students with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100**

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	Measurement A: The state target is 64.6% or above. Measurement B: The state target is 15.7% or below. Measurement C: The state target is 2.0% or below.

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address Least Restrictive Environment rates.

1. LEA met State Targets? X Yes No
2. If the target(s) was not met, complete the following for each target NOT met:
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.
 - B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.
 - C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Activity #16:

2011-2012- Continue to follow all state policies and procedures when determining LRE placement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool students with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships),**
- B. Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy), and**
- C. Outcome 3: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Measurement: See spreadsheet for calculations a through e for measurement A, B, and C. Use summary statement for each of the three Outcomes (A, B, & C).

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

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.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	<p>Baseline Data</p> <p>Measurement A: Outcome 1 - Summary Statement 1 = 85.9% Summary Statement 2 = 48.3%</p> <p>Measurement B: Outcome 2 - Summary Statement 1 = 86.9% Summary Statement 2 = 46.6%</p> <p>Measurement C: Outcome 3 - Summary Statement 1 = 86.1% Summary Statement 2 = 60.6%</p>

X Charter schools do not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)

NOTE: All LEAs serving students represented within this indicator must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address improving preschool student outcomes in the areas of positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

The LEA serving students represented within this indicator must answer the following questions:

1. What standardized testing instrument(s) are you using as a component of determining entry and exit COSF ratings (1-7)?
2. What on-going assessment instrument(s) are you using to determine exit COSF ratings (1-7)?
3. How are you collecting parent information?
4. How are you collecting observation data?
5. Are you using exit COSF ratings from Part C to assist in determining your entrance COSF ratings for Part B?
6. Is COSF training (including refresher training) conducted yearly?

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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 students with IEPs

Measurement: Percent equals the number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with IEPs divided by the total number of respondent parents of students with IEPs times 100.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	45% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address parent involvement.

As stated in the 2010 CIPP, CFCI's EC parents were sampled in a survey provided by the state during the 2008-09 school year. All parents were handed or mailed, with a follow up phone call, these surveys. 36 surveys went out but only 6 were returned. Of those 6 only 33% felt like the school properly facilitated parent involvement. Because of the small number of replies, it is hard to determine if this is in fact a pervasive feeling by parents.

In an ongoing effort to increase parent involvement and satisfaction, CIPP activities # 10 – 14 with some minor adjustments will continue to be implemented. Copies of all internal survey responses, transition activity and parent information session agendas and a current yearly brochure will be maintained for review. The CIPP activities and an informational EC link will be kept current on the schools website under the Parent Resource section. For reference see:

http://www.cfc.net/pdf/CFCI_CIPP_for_2010.pdf and http://www.cfc.net/pdf/website_information.pdf

The EC Coordinator will keep a log and follow up with any parent that indicates concerns regarding EC services.

Activities #11, 12, 14:

- 2011-2012- Coordinate Parent Information Series with the director and partnership board
- 2011-2012- Provide all EC parents with a post-IEP survey following annual reviews
- 2011-2012- Post the most current CIPP activities and make current updates to EC informational website link
- Jan 2012- Update the EC brochure "Serving Students with Disabilities" for the initial Parent Information Sessions
- Apr-May '12- Coordinate with 5th/6th grade staff and conduct a transition panel/meeting

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation – Child with a Disability

Indicator 9: LEA data indicate disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement: District data indicate the district has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	0% disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

The LEA does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education across all disability categories that is a result of inappropriate identification.

All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address this indicator.

CFCI serves a wide range of special needs in our relatively small population. Of the 41 students with disabilities reported on the December 1 Count:

- 7 students served as Other Health Impaired (OHI),
- 9 students Specific Learning Disabled (SLD),
- 6 students Autistic (AU),
- 4 students Seriously Emotionally Disabled (SED),
- 14 as Speech Impaired (SI) and;
- 1 student Developmentally Delayed (DD)

Statistically the racial student make-up of the school has remained approximately the same for several years with 84.66% white, 6.25% Black, and 9.09% other. The ‘other’ number includes students who are multi-racial, Hispanic and Asian. The EC gender and racial make-up by category on the 2011 CFCI’s April 1 count of 45 students is as follows:

- 8 OHI students;- 1 black male, 5 white males; 1 black female, 1 white female
- 10 SLD students - 2 black male, 1 multi-racial male, 3 white males;
1 black female, 1 Hispanic female, 2 white females
- 7 AU students- 5 white males, 2 white females
- 6 SED students- 1 black male, 3 white males; 1 black female, 1 white female
- 14 SI students- 1 multi-racial male, 2 Hispanic males, 8 white males;
3 white females

This puts our EC percentage at approximately 12.4% of our overall school population, with our male to female EC population ratio at approximately 7:3 which is reflective of the national EC population average in general. CFCI’s EC racial population ratios are also 7:3 with approximately 70% white and 30% non-white.

Activity #17:

- 2011-2012 – Compliance of all NC EC policies and procedures
- 2011-2012 – Compliance of all lottery procedures
- Jan. 2012 - 4 New Parent Information Sessions
- Feb 2012 - Lottery drawing for the following school year; held 3rd Thursday of the month

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation – Child with a Disability

Indicator 10: LEA data indicate disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement: LEA data indicate that there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	0% disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

The LEA does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is a result of inappropriate identification.

All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address this indicator.

CFCI is a school of choice where the student population is based on a lottery system. Our overall student demographic population has fewer children than the surrounding counties we draw from at or below the poverty level. The present gender ratio of CFCI’s student population has seen a one year 2.11% increase of female students to 55.11% overall with a drop to 44.89% of male students. Racially the student make-up has remained approximately the same for several years with 84.66% white, 6.25% Black, and 9.09% other. The ‘other’ number includes students who are multi-racial, Hispanic and Asian.

The faculty and staff make-up serving CFCI consists of 6 males (14.6%) and 35 females (85.4%); 37 are white (85.4%) and 6 are other races (14.6%). This percentage comes close to matching the breakdown of the student demographic numbers.

CFCI is in the process of strengthening its RtI initiative through regular education. The Curriculum Coordinator and EC Coordinator will facilitate this effort and conduct beginning year training, and ongoing training as indicated by the staff development schedule, for the faculty in the proper implementation and analysis of research-based interventions and how to identify the date when a parent makes a formal request to start the 90-day timeline. The EC Coordinator will continue to consult and will serve as the behavioral expert for the RtI Teams.

Activity #17:

- 2011-2012 – Compliance of all NC EC policies and procedures
- 2011-2012 – Compliance of all lottery procedures
- Jan. 2012 - 4 Parent Information Sessions
- Feb 2012 - Lottery drawing for the following school year; held 3rd Thursday of the month

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of students for whom a referral was received and placement determined within 90 days

Measurement:

A. Number of students for whom a referral for an evaluation was received excluding those students that transferred into or out of the LEA within the 90 days or transferred into the LEA after the 90 days expired or those that parents repeatedly failed or refused to produce student for an evaluation

B. Number of students whose referral, evaluations, eligibility, and if appropriate, IEP development, and placement determination were completed within 90 days

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.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	100% of students for whom a referral was received and placement determined within 90 days

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address meeting the required timeline.

- 1. All LEAs must describe the mechanism for tracking initial referrals.**
- 2. LEA met State Target? X Yes No**
- 3. If the target was not met, complete the following for each target NOT met:**
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.**

CFCI reported 100% compliance in meeting the 90 day timeline for the determination of eligibility status for all students referred for special education and/or related service consideration during the 2009-10 school year.

- B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.**

Activities #18 and #19 will be implemented to support the timely referral, assessment and determination of special education and/or related services. Increasing an emphasis on our RtI process and better utilizing the state’s CECAS system will help us ensure timely, accurate and consistent performance. These activities reflect the priorities of this school and the time, resources and attention paid to improving this aspect of our work is well worth the investment. The responsibility is clearly outlined and has the director’s approval.

C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Activity #18:

- August 16: Faculty staff development presented by Administrative Team and selected staff
- 2011-12: Meet and work with individual loop levels of teachers and RtI teams to facilitate implementation of the RtI process by child

Activity #19:

- 2010-11: CECAS utilized for all state reporting by EC Coordinator
- May 2011: Two CECAS IEP's completed and questions regarding program usage answered
- Aug 2011: CECAS Training to be provided for all EC teachers in IEP development
- 2011-12: Full implementation of CECAS for all facets of student tracking

Monitoring Priority: Early Childhood Transitions

Indicator 12: Percent of students 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

Measurement:

- A. Number of students who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination
- B. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays
- C. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
- D. Number of students for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services
- E. Number of students who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays

Percent = [C divided by (A – B – D – E)] x 100.

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	100% of students referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B and will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

 X Charter schools do not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)

NOTE: All LEAs serving students represented within this indicator **must** include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address students who were referred from Part C to Part B for eligibility determination by their third birthdays.

1. All LEAs must describe the mechanism for tracking Part C to Part B referrals.
2. LEA met State Target? _____ Yes _____ No
3. If the target was not met, complete the following:
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.
 - B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.
 - C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of students 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 reasonable 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.

Measurement:

- A. Percent of students aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measureable 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 students to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to transition services needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the 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 (number of students with an IEP age 16 and above) times 100**
- B. Percent of noncompliance identified in the 2008-09 school year and corrected within one year times 100**

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	<p>A. 100% of students aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measureable 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 students to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to transition services needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the 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.</p> <p>B. 100% of noncompliance identified in the 2008-09 school year and corrected within one year.</p>

 X This charter school does not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)

NOTE: All LEAs serving students represented within this indicator must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address compliance of required transition component of the IEP for students aged 16 and above.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

Measurement: The percent of responders that indicated:

- A. Enrollment in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
- B. Enrollment in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
- C. Enrollment 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.**

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 39% enrolled in higher education within 1 year of leaving high school. B. 62% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within 1 year of leaving high school. C. 73% enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training or competitively employed or some other type of employment within 1 year of leaving high school.

 X This charter school does not serve students represented within this indicator. (Proceed to next indicator.)

NOTE: All LEAs serving students represented within this indicator must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to ensure positive postsecondary outcomes.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Measurement: Percent of noncompliance identified in the 2008-09 school year corrected within one year of identification

A. Number of findings of noncompliance

B. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Percent = (B divided by A) times 100

	Measurable and Rigorous State Target
2009-10	100% of noncompliance (identified in 2008-09) corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year (2009-10) from identification (reported in October 2009 submission)

NOTE: All LEAs must include improvement activities on the CIPP Activities sheet to address identification and correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

1. All LEAs must describe the mechanism for the identification, correction, and verification of correction of noncompliance.
2. LEA met State Target? Yes No NA
3. If the target was not met, complete the following for each target NOT met:
 - A. Explain the progress or slippage of your LEA toward meeting the State Target for 2009-10 school year.

There were no corrective actions for the 2009-10 school year for CFCI.

B. Analyze the LEA activities (listed on the last page) for this target using the CIPP Improvement Activity Review Checklist. Summarize the results of the analysis including status of implementation.

Activity #20 is being implemented in order to put in writing a step by step procedure that anyone assigned the task could follow in case the need arises to identify, correct and verify any noncompliance that CFCI might incur. Currently the EC Coordinator utilizes the *Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities* and communication from DPI to reply to and provide any and all required responses as requested.

C. Document the action steps for implementing each activity.

Activity #20:

September – EC Coordinator will draft a written procedure for the Director’s approval

October 15 - Finalized procedure available for review

CIPP Activities Sheet

Indicator(s) Number	Measurable Improvement Activities:	Person(s) Responsible	Needed Resource(s)	Documentation of Implementation
#3c, 9, 10	#1 Early Intervention – Speech/Language Pathologist to conduct language portions of DIAL-3 screenings conducted in June on incoming kindergarteners and note children with any speech concerns	EC Coordinator; Speech Pathologist; Kindergarten teachers	DIAL-3 materials; speech checklist by age	Copies of DIAL-3 maintained in cumulative folder; speech pathologist maintains checklist of students noting concern for fall follow-up
#3c, 9, 10	#2 Early Intervention – Occupational Therapist provides whole group activities to increase fine motor skills in all kindergarten and 1 st grade classrooms 1 time per week for 30 minutes	EC Coordinator; Occupational Therapist; Kindergarten teachers	Various materials provided by EC department	Therapist activity log; timesheets
#3c	#3 Reading - Lexia reading (all 3 programs) implemented in all K – 5 classrooms	EC Coordinator, Technology Teacher, Classrm Teachers	Working computers with weblink; assessment data	Lexia – Report Management System; reports maintained by class and student
#3c	#4 Reading - Specific student skills evaluations conducted by EC Reading Teacher during reading RtI process	EC Coordinator; EC Reading Teacher	Reading assessment materials; written report	Reading assessment report provided the RtI team for use in determining appropriate interventions
#3c	#5 Reading – Individualized, with carefully monitored, reading skills instruction for designated EC K-8 students	EC Teaching Staff	Program monitoring materials; CBM's	Progress Monitoring Data analyzed, utilized to inform instruction and maintained for IEP Team review
#3b	#6 EOG's - Communication with all EC 3-8 parents to ensure 100% EC student participation in EOG testing	Testing Coordinator; EC Coordinator	School communication; letter from EC Coordinator	Copies of 1) posting of school-wide communication; 2) letter to 3-8 EC parents; 3) EOG participation data
#3c	#7 Math - Specific student skills evaluations conducted by Math EC Teacher during math RtI process	EC Coordinator; EC Math Teacher	Math assessment materials; CBM's	Math assessment report provided the RtI team for use in determining appropriate interventions
#3c	#8 Math – Individualized, with carefully monitored, math skills instruction for designated EC K-8 students	EC Teaching Staff	Program monitoring materials; CBM's	Progress Monitoring Data analyzed, utilized to inform instruction and maintained for IEP Team review
#3c	#9 Math – Addition of EC teacher support services in the middle school general education math classes supporting lower EC math students a minimum of 3 days per week	EC Coordinator; EC Math Teacher	Common planning; weekly class plans & curriculum resources	Teacher daily schedule; classroom plans; Progress Monitoring Data by student

#3c, 8	#10 Transition - To support positive transition into Middle School, convene a Spring 6 th grade panel presentation for a 5 th grade audience; parents invited	EC Staff to coordinate with 5 th & 6 th grade teachers	Calendar date; location; 6 th grade student preparation	Invitation, agenda and student feedback
#8	#11 Parent Information Series – conducted quarterly and offered in conjunction with Dialogue with the Director sessions and Partnership Meetings on topics specific to serving the needs of EC students.	EC Coordinator; Director; Partnership Board	Determine topics, presenter, handouts	Sign-in sheets; handout copies
#8, 15	#12 Implement annually a post-IEP meeting parent satisfaction survey	EC Staff	Provide copies	Maintain surveys; analyze responses and document parent communication follow-ups
#8	#13 Provide an updated information brochure titled “Serving Students with Disabilities” at all initial CFCI parent information sessions.	EC Coordinator	Maintain available updated copies	Maintain a copy of the brochure for review
#8	#14 Utilize the school’s website to post the yearly CIPP submission with activities and maintain a current EC information link under the parent resources section.	EC Coordinator; Website manager	Available web link information for postings	Maintain a copy of all posted information
#4	#15 Implement behavioral interventions to include visual schedules, FBA/BIP’s, contracts, consult with regular education teachers to assist in implementation of strategies to reduce negative student behaviors, providing evidence of IEP placement change(s) and CPI trained crisis team response(s)	Behavioral Specialist; Behavioral EC Assistant; EC Coordinator; Director	Training; research based intervention information	Maintain a log of staff training, student RtI interventions, crisis interventions and restraint documentation follow up as appropriate
#5	#16 To ensure placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE), CFCI will continue to assume regular setting placement for all students unless clear significant data exists to drive an alternate placement	EC Coordinator, IEP Team	Instructional & behavioral data; all IEP documentation	Maintain confidential files; maintain separate copies of paperwork where a placement decision other than regular, 80% or greater with non-disabled peers, is determined
#9, 10	#17 CFCI will continue school-wide student selection through a lottery system held one time per year and continue to follow state outlined policies for the identification of any student in need of special education	Director Administrative Asst. EC Coordinator EC Staff	CECAS, Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities	Maintain confidential files; regular state reporting

#11	#18 Strengthen Responsiveness to Instruction (RtI) process to look at all factors effecting student progress including, but not limited to, setting, instruction, medical issues/concerns, parent information, early developmental milestones, and school continuance of placement.	Curriculum Coordinator, EC Coordinator, RtI Team	Training, resources providing research based interventions	Maintain a log of RtI training, meetings and student assessment and intervention documentation
#11	#19 Utilizing CECAS and a posted visual spreadsheet, track all referral dates and 90 day determination dates	EC Coordinator	CECAS, Excel spreadsheet	Maintain copies of all 90 day determination information
#15	#20 CFCI will develop a the written procedure addressing the general supervision of its EC services in case the need arises to correct a noncompliance, respond to a formal complaint, or participate in a formal hearing	EC Coordinator; Director	Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities, DPI consultation, Research	Maintain copy of written plan; Maintain copies of any all records