

Table A – South Carolina Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>The State did not provide baseline data for 2004-2005. On page 2, indicator 2 of the SPP, the State reported baseline data for 2003-2004, explaining that, the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools reporting process “is one year in arrears.”</p>	<p>In the APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must include both updated baseline data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and its first reporting of progress data for this target from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP’s determination in 2007 of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. 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 against alternate achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 4, Indicator 3 of the SPP, SCDE provided the participation and performance percentages of students with disabilities, but did not, as required, also provide actual <u>numbers</u>.</p>	<p>The State must include the required data and calculations in reporting its participation and performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 7 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP’s February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State’s FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The measure for Indicator 12 required the State to report the percentage of Part B eligible children transitioning from Part C for whom an IEP was developed and implemented by their third birthday. On page 2 Indicator 12, the State provided data regarding the percentage of children for whom eligibility for Part B was determined, but did not provide the required percentage of children for whom an IEP was developed and implemented by their third birthday. On page 3 Indicator 12 the State explained that it would be able to provide the required data in the future.</p>	<p>In the APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must include both the required baseline data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and its first reporting of progress data for this target from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>On page 1 Indicator 14 of the SPP, the State reported that it would design a system to collect the required information for youth with disabilities who dropout of school. The State further reported that it would revise the system to improve the response level of and would build into the system an analysis and correction of non-response as needed.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new indicator 14 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The SPP required the State to report on the percentage of the findings of noncompliance that it made in 2003-2004 that were corrected in 2004-2005. On page 5 Indicator 15, the State provided baseline data regarding its correction, in 2003-2004, of noncompliance it identified in 2002-2003. On page 6, Indicator 15, the State reported that the focused monitoring process began in January 2005, and that 2004-2005 baseline data will be included in APR due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005, i.e., the percentage of findings from 2003-2004 that were corrected in 2004-2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006, i.e., the percentage of findings from 2004-2005 that were corrected in 2005-2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>