

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 42.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 46.1%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 40.3%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 5.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the target for FFY 2009 for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and the revised target for FFY 2009. The revised FFY 2009 target is more rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.49%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 66%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.4% for reading and 98.4% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.2% for math. The FFY 2008 data for reading were 98.2%. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to its 2009 publicly-reported assessment results. However, the data posted at the Web link provided by the State do not show that the State met the reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f), for the following reasons: the data do not provide the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and/or school levels. The data also do not provide the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and/or school levels. The State reported that it was planning to report these data in district data profiles to be published June 1, 2011.</p>	<p>with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported: (1) the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and/or school levels; and (2) the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and/or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must continue</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and the revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for grades 3-8 for this indicator are 52.3% for reading and 46% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2009 targets of 57.8% for reading and 58.8% for math.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for high school are 58.5% for reading and 54.1% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State met its revised FFY 2009 target of 57.8% for reading and did not meet its 2009 target of 58.8% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to its 2009 publicly-reported assessment results. However, the data posted at the Web link provided by the State do not show that the State met the reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f), because the data do not provide, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and/or school levels. The State reported that it was planning to report these data in district data profiles to be published June 1, 2011.</p>	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and/or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided revised FFY 2009 baseline data, a revised target for FFY 2010, targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 5.68%. Because the State provided revised baseline data, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data or to an FFY 2009 target.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement and that no LEAs were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEAs’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEA identified with noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 2.27%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that two districts were identified as having 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.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does use a minimum “n” size requirement, but that no districts were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEAs’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, a revised FFY 2009 target for Indicator 5B, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1133 1583 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">56.8</td> <td align="center">56.2</td> <td align="center">54.31</td> <td align="center">-0.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">19.7</td> <td align="center">19.9</td> <td align="center">15.45</td> <td align="center">-0.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or</td> <td align="center">2.43</td> <td align="center">1.73</td> <td align="center">2.19</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.8	56.2	54.31	-0.60%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19.7	19.9	15.45	-0.20%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	2.43	1.73	2.19	0.70%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.8	56.2	54.31	-0.60%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19.7	19.9	15.45	-0.20%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	2.43	1.73	2.19	0.70%																		

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>				<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																
	homebound/hospital placements																				
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>				<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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 early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets and the revised FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1149 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1149 1035 1252"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="1035 1149 1203 1252"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1149 1394 1252"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1394 1149 1583 1252"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1252 1035 1354"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1035 1252 1203 1354">84.19</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1252 1394 1354">86.38</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1394 1252 1583 1354">84.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1354 1035 1490"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1035 1354 1203 1490">81.86</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1354 1394 1490">84.43</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1394 1354 1583 1490">81.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1490 1035 1521"><b>Outcome C:</b></td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1035 1490 1203 1521">84.22</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1490 1394 1521">86.72</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1394 1490 1583 1521">84.22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.19	86.38	84.19	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	81.86	84.43	81.86	<b>Outcome C:</b>	84.22	86.72	84.22	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																		
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.19	86.38	84.19																		
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	81.86	84.43	81.86																		
<b>Outcome C:</b>	84.22	86.72	84.22																		

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)				
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	69.52	70.68	69.52	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.10	65.36	62.10	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	82.49	82.28	82.49	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. Except for Summary Statement 2, Outcome C, the State met its FFY 2009 targets for this 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 children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 38%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 36%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 30.83%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that ten of 86 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of greater than 25 and were excluded from the calculation.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 37 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that none of its LEAs were excluded from all six disability categories, and therefore, all 86 LEAs were included in the calculation for disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.16%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected. The State further reported that it also made findings of noncompliance in these same LEAs in FFY 2007, none of which have been corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining six uncorrected noncompliance</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR and FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 29, 2010.</p>	<p>findings identified in FFY 2007 and again in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and again in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 25 of 35 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that ten findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported that 35 of 38 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR and FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 29, 2010.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has corrected this</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, and targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and improvement activities through 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 98.92%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 24.36% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 50.23% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 65.92% 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.</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 77%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 117 of 127 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the ten remaining findings identified in FFY 2008 were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, that the remaining 55 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR, and the remaining eight findings from FFY 2006 reported in Indicators 11 and 12, were corrected. The State reported that 45 of 55 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. For the uncorrected</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. The State also reported that all remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 were corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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 States received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR and FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 29, 2010.</p>	<p>2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on these targets. The revised FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 60%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 60%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010</p>

**South Carolina Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Results Indicator]	<p>The State reported that both of two mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held.</p>	APR, due February 1, 2012.
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>