

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

While the State has publicly reported on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I), those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the State reported the data for each district, but rather than providing the State targets as required, the State reported the State's FFY 2005 performance.

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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 38.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 39.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 38.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, both percentages and actual numbers of students with disabilities graduating with a diploma. The State provided the required information.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 7.88%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 7.10%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 7.83%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, valid and reliable data regarding the percent of youth with disabilities dropping out; for this indicator, both the numerator and the denominator must be for youth with disabilities, and to recalculate its baseline (using FFY 2004 data). The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.35%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.52%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 35.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99% for English/language arts (E/LA) and 99% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86% for E/LA and 87% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 95% for E/LA and math.</p>	<p>Table 6 in the State's FFY 2005 APR reported the total number of students in each grade level, who did not participate in the E/LA assessment, but did not break these data down in columns 6 (parental exemptions), 7 (absent), and 8 (exempt for other reasons). OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State reported that, it does not offer parental exemptions for State Assessments. "Students either absent for testing or exempt because of a medical condition were counted in one column in Table 6 as neither the Office of Assessment nor the Office of Research breaks that number into categories. Students who did not test for any reason are listed in that column."</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 16.9% for E/LA and 17.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 15.5% for E/LA and 15.6% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 21.6% for E/LA and 19% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.88%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 4.55%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 9%.</p>	<p>response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of 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 as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR. The State described its review process for the four LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies for the 2005-06 school year but did not specify that the review for those districts covered policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must 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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<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>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</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 5C targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 781 1432 1198"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Revised FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>49.31%</td> <td>53.9%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>23.21%</td> <td>21.6%</td> <td>17.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.19%</td> <td>2.42%</td> <td>= to or <2.19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These FFY 2006 data are not valid and reliable because the State appears to have used the same data as it reported under section 618 of the IDEA for FFY 2006, and that data is not valid and reliable because it does not match the State's child count data for that year.</p>		Revised FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.31%	53.9%	50%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	23.21%	21.6%	17.45%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.19%	2.42%	= to or <2.19%	<p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	Revised FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.31%	53.9%	50%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	23.21%	21.6%	17.45%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.19%	2.42%	= to or <2.19%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>		
<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 early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>The State's data are not valid and reliable because the State did not provide progress data consistent with the measurement for FFY 2006. For each of the three functional areas, the State provided progress data only for children who were at a level below same-aged peers when they entered the program in FFY 2005, and who, when they exited the program in FFY 2006, were at a level comparable to same-aged peers. The State provided only entry data for children who entered the program in FFY 2006.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data and improvement activities.</p> <p>The State did not report the required progress data. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised an improvement activity for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 30%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 29%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 29%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a copy of the parent survey. The State provided a copy of the parent survey as an attachment to the February 1, 2008 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, documentation that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined based on the data, that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). This was based on an improvement activity that linked disproportionate representation to significant disproportionality.</p> <p>South Carolina reported that 0% of its LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for FFY 2005, and therefore, no LEA would have been required to reserve funds for EIS prior to the removal of this improvement activity. The State removed that improvement activity. In the future, if any districts meet the State's criteria for significant disproportionality, the State must ensure that it is complying with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.646.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</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>Consistent with OSEP's direction in the June 15, 2007 response table, the State deleted its FFY 2005 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that revision. The State also revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.7%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, documentation that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 7.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that five of the six LEAs identified in 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 the one LEA will receive focused monitoring, including on-site visits, in depth review of referral, evaluation and eligibility practices (and revision, if necessary), monitoring of progress and targeted technical assistance.</p>	<p>it is determined based on the data, that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). See the discussion of this issue under Indicator 9, above.</p> <p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) revised its baseline to reflect FFY 2005 data (because the State provided baseline data for FFY 2004 rather than FFY 2005), and reported on progress data for FFY 2006; 2) revised the 'target' for FFY 2005 to 0%; and 3) reported on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there was disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services 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>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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 89.32%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. In Indicator 15, the State reported that 20 of 80 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that, due to the challenges faced by districts and the Office of Exceptional Children (OEC) in collecting and verifying these data, program-specific follow-up activities related to this indicator centered around technical assistance in how to report valid and reliable data.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of how it is collecting data for this indicator, including 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 a description of how it collects the data related to this indicator, but did not include 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, and the State must provide the required information in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 78%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, compliance with the</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>In Indicator 15, the State reported that 17 of 32 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the systemic finding identified in FFY 2004 was not corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, the State reported that, due to the challenges faced by districts and the Office of Exceptional Children (OEC) in collecting and verifying these data, program-specific follow-up activities related to this indicator centered around technical assistance in how to report valid and reliable data.</p>	<p>requirements in 34 CFR §300.124, including data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its FFY 2005 target to 100% for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>In Indicator 15, the State reported that ten of 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that program-specific activities included the OEC's Transition Coordinator's on-site visits to provide technical assistance. The districts were required to use the transition goal checklist developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 36%.</p>	<p>APR.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 71%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 98.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that program-specific follow-up activities related to the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 were described in its discussion of each of the APR compliance indicators.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported data consistent with the measurement.</p> <p>In the FFY 2005 APR, the State reported that 91% of the findings of noncompliance from 2003-2004 were corrected by the end of 2004-2005. The State also reported that sanctions were imposed on the remaining two districts that failed to correct issues of noncompliance in the area of suspension and expulsion. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State was required to report on its continued correction activities in those districts.</p> <p>The State reported that it has taken enforcement action regarding the findings of noncompliance for the two remaining districts from FFY 2004.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87.18%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 97.96%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, valid and reliable data and ensure that the data in the APR narrative and in Table 7 are consistent with each other. The State provided data that were consistent across the APR and Table 7.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</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.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four hearings. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

South Carolina's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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 reported that four of nine resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State is not required to meet its targets until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not report actual target data for this indicator in the APR. However, in Table 7, the State reported that one of two mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. 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 held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 89.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR, data that demonstrated compliance with the requirements of IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>