

**South Carolina Part C FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<b>Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments</b>		
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for FFY 2005 for this indicator are 95.7% (or 3324/3475).  Under the State's September 9, 2003 Part C Compliance Agreement with the Department, the State established its FFY 2005 target at 95% with an FFY 2006 target of 100% by September 9, 2006. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>The timely service provision requirements in this indicator were the subject of a September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement between the State and the U.S. Department of Education (Department or OSEP). OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement on March 31, 2006 and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance with these requirements in the final Progress Report, due September 30, 2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR indicate that the State's FFY 2005 data are 95.7%. OSEP calculated this percentage based on the number of infants and toddlers who received timely services (3315) plus the number of delays attributable to documented family circumstances (9) divided by the number of children with active IFSPs (3475). In the State's September 29, 2006 final progress report, it reported data of 95%.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's FFY 2005 efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in (and will respond to the State's FFY 2006 data after reviewing) the State's FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the timely service requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of any findings identified during FFY 2005 under this indicator.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 86%. These data represent slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 95.9%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 96%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>It is important that the State also monitor to ensure that IFSP teams make individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements.</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</li> <li>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</li> <li>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</li> </ul> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	Entry data provided.	The State reported the required entry data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Know their rights;</li> <li>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and</li> <li>C. Help their children develop and learn.</li> </ul> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4A. 74%</li> <li>4B. 70%</li> <li>4C. 86%</li> </ul>	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA	OSEP's February 2, 2007 response to the State's September 29, 2006 Final Progress Report under the Compliance Agreement indicated the State had

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>section 618 are .66%. These data represent slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data under IDEA section 618 of .7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of .9%.</p>	<p>implemented its strategies under the Compliance Agreement. The State's FFY 2005 data under IDEA section 618 reflect slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.87%. These data represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data under IDEA section 618 of 1.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 2.24%.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 2, 2007 response to the State's September 29, 2006 Final Progress Report under the Compliance Agreement indicated the State had implemented its strategies under the Compliance Agreement.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 data under IDEA section 618 reflect progress from the State's FFY 2004 data under IDEA section 618 and OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating continued improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP calculated the State's FFY 2005 census data for this indicator as 97.9% (or 3336 + 66 divided into 3475) as of June 10, 2006.</p> <p>Under the State's September 9, 2003 Part C Compliance Agreement with the Department, the State established its FFY 2005 target at 96% and an FFY 2006 target of 100% by September 9, 2006.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 96% during FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided updated monitoring data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period indicating</p>	<p>The State revised its SPP/APR improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The 45-day timeline requirements of this indicator were the subject of the State's September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement with the Department. OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a) in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement on March 31, 2006 and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance with these requirements in the final Progress Report due September 30, 2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR census data for this indicator are 97.9% (for which the denominator of 3475 represents the number of eligible children with IFSPs). However, data under the Compliance Agreement required the State to measure the 45-day timeline for all children referred to Part C. The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided monitoring data reflecting this broader measurement and indicating 89% compliance (as of January 1, 2007). The State's FFY 2005 census data under this indicator of 97.9% and its January 1, 2007 updated</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>89% compliance as of January 1, 2007, and also indicating that its findings under this indicator had not been corrected.</p>	<p>monitoring data of 89% both represent a significant improvement from the State's FFY 2004 monitoring data of 57% as of July 12, 2004.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's FFY 2005 efforts regarding the 45-day timeline requirements and looks forward to reviewing data in the State's FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a), including correction of all findings identified in the State's March 30, 2007 submission.</p> <p>A requirement related to this indicator that was also the subject of the State's Compliance Agreement with the Department is that children receive evaluations in all five developmental areas as required by 34 CFR §§303.322(a)(1) and 303.322(c)(3)(ii). The State was required to, but did not, include, in its September 2006 final Progress Report, data demonstrating compliance with the requirement that evaluations are conducted in all five developmental areas, as required by 34 CFR §§303.322(a)(1) and 303.322(c)(3)(ii).</p> <p>The State's March 30, 2007 submission indicates correction of findings made by the State with the comprehensive evaluation requirements. Specifically, the State corrected its comprehensive evaluation findings made in Regions 2 and 3 in FFY 2005, Region 5 in FFY 2004, and Region 4 in FFY 2006. The State also reported related findings in these areas in Regions 2 (regarding vision) and 6 (all areas) in August 2006, but the one-year timeline for correction of these findings had not yet lapsed as of the March 30, 2007 date of the State's submission.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing updated data through December 31, 2007, in Indicators 7 and 9 of the State's FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate correction of the findings in Regions 2 and 6 of the comprehensive evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §§303.322(a)(1) and 303.322(c)(3)(ii).</p>
<p>8A. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR were not consistent with the required measurement for this indicator, and were not, therefore, valid and reliable. Initial data in the FFY 2004 APR indicated 95%</p>	<p>The IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) of this indicator were the subject of the State's September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement with the Department. OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress with these requirements in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement in March 31, 2006, and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance in the</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>compliance in November 2005. However, the State in the FFY 2005 APR did not provide a specific statewide percentage, as required by the measurement for this indicator, but rather, noted that it had monitored three programs whose compliance ranged from 53% to 80%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period indicating correction, but it is unclear whether the correction was complete or timely.</p>	<p>final Progress Report due September 30, 2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR indicated three monitoring visits had identified noncompliance in specific early intervention services (EIS) programs ranging from 53% to 80%. The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period indicating some correction but it is unclear whether the correction was complete or timely.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p>
<p>8B. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) under this indicator were the subject of the State's September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement with the Department. OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress with these requirements in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement in March 31, 2006, and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance in the final Progress Report due September 30, 2006. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8C. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93%.</p>	<p>The timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as amended by IDEA section 637(a)(9)) under this indicator were the subject of the State's September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement with the Department.</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Under the State's September 9, 2003 Part C Compliance Agreement with the Department, the State established its FFY 2005 target at 95% with an FFY 2006 target of 100% by September 9, 2006. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period, indicating 87% for Part C children who turned three between March 7 and June 20, 2007.</p> <p>The State's March 2007 submission indicated correction of findings under this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress with these requirements in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement in March 31, 2006, and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance in the final Progress Report due September 30, 2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93%. The State's March 30, 2007 submission provided data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period of 87% for Part C children who turned three between March 7 through June 20, 2007. The State's March 2007 submission also indicated timely correction of findings under this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as amended by IDEA section 637(a)(9)).</p>
<p>9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR provided neither FFY 2005 data nor any other information for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's March 30, 2007 submission in response to OSEP's February 2007 letter responding to the State's Compliance Agreement Final Report provided a chronological list of programs monitored, a list of findings, and status of correction and explanation of findings not corrected. While OSEP could not determine whether each finding was specifically</p>	<p>The identification and timely correction requirements in 34 CFR §303.501(b) under this indicator were the subject of the State's September 9, 2003 Compliance Agreement with the Department. OSEP's March 28, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data demonstrating progress in the Progress Reports due under the Compliance Agreement on March 31, 2006, and June 30, 2006, and data demonstrating compliance in the final Progress Report due September 30, 2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR provided no data for this indicator. OSEP's February 2, 2007 response to the State's September 29, 2006 Final Progress Report required the State to provide, within 60 days of the letter, an updated list of entities monitored through September 30, 2006; the status of correction of all findings made; for any findings that were not corrected within one year, an explanation of why not and how DHEC is ensuring compliance; and DHEC's final monitoring manual or procedures describing how DHEC tracks implementation of corrective actions. The State's failure to provide any</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>corrected or what the State required for correction, it appears that many findings were determined corrected by the State. However, a number of findings are outstanding, including: (1) the 45-day timeline requirements in Indicator 7 (from findings made as early as August 2004); and (2) other findings such as the ones referenced in Indicator 7 above regarding comprehensive evaluations.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>information including FFY 2005 data in the FFY 2005 APR is a factor in the Department's Determination of the State's performance under IDEA section 616.</p> <p>In its March 30, 2007 response, the State included a list of the regions monitored through September 30, 2006; the status of correction of all findings made; an explanation of the findings that were not corrected within one year; and the final monitoring manual. The State reported that, in all eight regions, it did not correct noncompliance within one year from identification for the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a).</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100% and OSEP cannot determine a specific percentage of compliance for FFY 2005 for this indicator. The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State's data for this indicator: (1) identify a specific percentage based on the measurement for this indicator; and (2) demonstrate compliance with the timely correction requirements in IDEA section 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and in the State's March 30, 2007 submission.</p> <p>In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the District must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of any findings made in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 and the status of correction. The State must, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C, specifically identify and address the correction of noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 67%, based on the timely resolution of 8 of the 12 complaints filed during FFY 2005. These data represent slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 88% (based on the timely resolution of 16 of 18 complaints received).</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512(b).</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	2005 target of 100%.	
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State did not receive any hearing requests during the reporting period.	The State did not receive any hearing requests during the reporting period.
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).  [Results Indicator; New]	Not applicable.	Not applicable as the State has adopted the Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.  [Results Indicator]	No mediations held.	The State is not required to provide or meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 APR indicates only that, "Child count and exiting data submitted December 2006." The State did not provide a specific percentage for this indicator and its FFY 2005 data do not fully reflect the measurement for this indicator.  The State's FFY 2005 APR did not provide FFY 2005 data for Indicator 8A that were consistent with the	The State's FFY 2005 APR reported for Indicator 14 only that, "Child count and exiting data [under IDEA section 618] were submitted in December 2006." The State provided neither a percentage nor data that fully reflect the measurement for this indicator, which includes the timeliness and accuracy of data under both IDEA section 618 (child count, exit, and settings data) and SPP/FFY 2005 APR data under IDEA sections 616 and 642. The State's FFY 2005 APR did not provide FFY 2005 data for Indicator 8A that were consistent with the required measurement, and provided no data for Indicator 9.  The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the



<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>required measurement, and provided no data for Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>State's data for this indicator: (1) include a specific <i>percentage of compliance</i> (OSEP is available to provide technical assistance on how to calculate this percentage); (2) reflect the timeliness and accuracy of the State's FFY 2006 data under IDEA sections 616 and 618; and (3) demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>