

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 45.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 38.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 40.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 8.10%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 7.88%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 7.33%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 2.35%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 35.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99% for English/language arts (E/LA) and 99% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99% for E/LA and remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18% for E/LA and 18% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 16.9% for E/LA and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 17.3% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 24.6% for E/LA and 22% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 29.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 5.88%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 29.4%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, a description of the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007. The State provided a description of the results of its examination of the FFY 2007 data.</p> <p>OSEP's table also required the State to describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
	<p>LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>															
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1117 1467 1481"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>53.9</td> <td>56.39</td> <td>51</td> <td>2.49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>21.6</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>16.45</td> <td>1.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	53.9	56.39	51	2.49%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	21.6	20.5	16.45	1.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress													
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	53.9	56.39	51	2.49%													
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	21.6	20.5	16.45	1.10%													

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.41	2.43	2.19	-0.01%	<p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2006 data were not valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5A and did not meet its targets for 5B and 5C.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>							
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.				The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1255 1419 1463"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1255 1062 1430">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 1255 1178 1430">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 1255 1293 1430">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1293 1255 1419 1430">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1430 1062 1463">a. % of preschoolers who did not</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1430 1178 1463">.00</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1430 1293 1463">1.67</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1430 1419 1463">0.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not	.00	1.67	0.00	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior										
a. % of preschoolers who did not	.00	1.67	0.00										

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	improve functioning.				
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.00	6.67	1.67	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	10.00	11.67	8.33	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	56.67	56.67	41.67	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28.33	23.33	48.33	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.01 %	100.00 %	
	<p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the required progress data for this indicator. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>				
<p>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 children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 30%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 29.61%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that three of four LEAs identified in FFY 2006 (including the identified LEA from FFY 2005) as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that targeted technical assistance will be provided to the LEA with the remaining noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 89.32%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 17 of 61 LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 corrected that noncompliance in a timely manner. OSEP notes though, that in Indicator 15, the State reported that the one FFY 2006 finding related to this indicator was timely corrected. Further, as the State reported during the September 2008 verification visit and in Indicator 15, the State did not issue written findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2006 data for this indicator until the end of FFY 2007 (June 27, 2008).</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance in the remaining 44 LEAs, the State reported that it will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs concerning this indicator. This will include assisting LEAs with data entry and the utilization of extracted reports from its database for timeline tracking purposes and that LEAs with findings of noncompliance will also be required to submit benchmark extracted reports as part of their corrective actions.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information about whether it is collecting information about all children for whom parental consent for initial evaluations is received, or a subset of that group. The State provided data showing that it is collecting information about all children for whom parental consent was received.</p> <p>OSEP's response table also required the State to report on correction of the noncompliance for FFY 2005. The State reported that all previous</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that uncorrected findings of noncompliance in the remaining 44 LEAs were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR and each of the 44 LEAs with remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2006 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>outstanding findings of noncompliance from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 were corrected during FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of 25 LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. OSEP notes, though, that in Indicator 15 the State reported that the one FFY 2006 finding related to this indicator was timely corrected. Further, as the State reported during the September 2008 verification visit and in Indicator 15, the State did not issue written findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2006 data for this indicator until the end of FFY 2007 (June 27, 2008). The State reported that it will continue to provide technical assistance to the remaining 18 LEAs with an emphasis on the use of data extract reports and that the data managers from Part C and Part B will collaborate monthly to assist with each agencies' exchange and verification of data.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance for FFY 2005. The State reported under Indicator 15 that all previous outstanding findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 were corrected during FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that uncorrected findings of noncompliance in the remaining 18 LEAs were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR and each of the 18 LEAs with remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2006 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP,</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 99.34%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of 13 LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. The State required the six districts that did not meet the compliance target of 100% to attend the two annual transition summits.</p> <p>OSEP notes, though, that in Indicator 15 the State reported that three of three FFY 2006 dispute resolution findings related to this indicator were timely corrected. Further, the State reported during the September 2008 Verification Visit and in Indicator 15, the State did not issue written findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2006 data for this indicator until the end of FFY 2007 (June 27, 2008).</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported under Indicator 15, that all previous outstanding findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 were corrected during FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance findings in the remaining six LEAs were corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR and each of the remaining six LEAs with noncompliance reported in the FFY 2006 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 36%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 38%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to address in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, whether the response group was representative of the State's population. The State reported that the survey did not include items related to race/ethnicity, primary disability/exceptionality, or other demographic information.</p>	<p>February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.68%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2006 data of 99.23%. The State reported that these FFY 2007 data reflect findings identified through on-site monitoring visits, complaints, and due process hearings, and do not include any noncompliance identified through SPP Indicators 9-13 because LEAs were not notified of findings in those areas until June 2008.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 89 of 94 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner, and that in addition to the data that the State provided in the Indicator 15 Worksheet, the State indicated in narrative that 16 of 17 findings made in Head Start programs were timely corrected, and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected within seventeen days of the one-year due date.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, documentation that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFYs 2004 and FFY 2005. The State reported that all previous outstanding findings of noncompliance from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 were corrected during FFY 2007.</p> <p>OSEP's January 15, 2009 verification visit response letter also required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, its analysis of the reasons contributing to its failure to ensure: (1) timely correction of identified noncompliance; and (2) subsequent correction for findings not timely corrected, and its plan for addressing those barriers. As noted above, the State reported that it timely corrected 89 of 94 FFY 2006 findings (94.68%). The State's worksheet for</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>Indicator 15 shows that four of the five FFY 2006 findings that were not timely corrected were identified through dispute resolution decisions. The State described the steps it has taken to improve follow-up on the correction of dispute resolution findings.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, as required by OSEP's January 15, 2009 verification letter, the State must, with its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, provide a written assurance that it: (1) makes findings of noncompliance without unreasonable delay from the date it has reliable data reflecting noncompliance; and (2) requires correction of all identified noncompliance, without regard to the compliance level of the program. The State also must provide the documentation described in OSEP's January 15, 2009 letter regarding the issue of subgranting IDEA funds to Head Start programs that were not LEAs.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87.18%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 52.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 44%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 67.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 33.3%. The State reported that three of nine mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 89.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		20 Data Rubric.