Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

John de la Howe

Overview

In 2004, the U.S. Congress reauthorized the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA). This legislation was intended to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities by continuing to ensure that each student is provided a free appropriate public education. To accomplish this task, this legislation authorized funding to states and local education agencies (LEAs), along with outlining specific ways of measuring students' progress in special education.

As part of this effort, states were required to develop a six-year State Performance Plan (SPP) to establish a foundation for gauging the progress of students with disabilities at the state and LEA levels. In the SPP, states were required to establish baseline data, along with rigorous targets for improving student outcomes in special education. South Carolina's SPP can be accessed at http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/173/StatePerformancePlanandStateDetermination.cfm.

According to the IDEA, the state (South Carolina Department of Education) is required to report annually to the public on the progress made by all LEAs and state-operated school programs against state targets. This Annual Performance Report (APR) describes the state's progress through the SPP indicators, as well as whether or not the state achieved the rigorous targets established in the SPP. South Carolina's current APR may be found at http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/173/StatePerformancePlanandStateDetermination.cfm.

Each state is required to publicly report its SPP and APR, and is required to report the performance of each LEA with regards to the special education indicators described in the SPP and APR. Following is the Special Education LEA Profile that provides a summary of indicators against which each LEA is measured. Collectively, these indicators compare each LEA's performance against the state's targets for educational programs for students with disabilities. Individually, these indicators can help identify areas where improvements are needed and provide a measure of progress toward the goals established in the SPP.

This report is broken down into four zones of clustered indicators in which local school LEA's outcomes are compared against the state established targets (outlined in the SPP). Additionally, each indicator reports the source of the data used, the regulatory citations, the date the data were obtained and indicates whether or not the LEA met or exceeded the state targets.

For more information regarding special education services in South Carolina, please visit the South Carolina Department of Education at www.ed.sc.gov or call 803-734-8224.

Regulatory Citation: The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004, Section 616 states "(C) PUBLIC REPORTING AND PRIVACY- (I) PUBLIC REPORT- The State shall report annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan."

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

ZONE ONE OUTCOMES – John de la Howe

ARE YOUNG CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES BEGINNING SCHOOL READY TO LEARN?

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- **Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
- **Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and**
- **Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Summary Statements **(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**	Outcome A LEA	Outcome A State Target	Outcome B LEA	Outcome B State Target	Outcome C LEA	Outcome C State Target
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, B, and C, what was the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program?	NR	≥ 85.69%	NR	≥ 83.36%	NR	≥ 85.72%
2. What was the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A, B, and C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program?	NR	≥ 71.02%	NR	≥ 63.60%	NR	≥ 83.99%

Indicator 12: Preschool Transition	**LEA**	**State Target**
What was the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays? (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	NA	**100%**

Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environment (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	**LEA**	**State Target**
What was the percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program?	NR	**52.7%**
What was the percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility?	NR	**24%**

Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

ZONE TWO OUTCOMES – John de la Howe
ARE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES ACHIEVING AT HIGH LEVELS?

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments **(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**		
	LEA	**State Target**
AYP – Did the LEA meet the State's AMO targets in both English language arts **and** mathematics**?**	No	Baseline
What was the participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments in English language arts **and in** mathematics**?**		≥95%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards in English language arts **in elementary and middle school?**		≥79.4%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards in English language arts **in high school?**		≥90.3%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards in mathematics **in elementary and middle school?**		≥79%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards in mathematics **in high school?**		≥90%
FOR PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE RESULTS PLEASE VISIT http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/173/DataCollectionHistory.cfm and SELECT 2011 IDEA ASSESSMENT REPORT.		

Indicator 4: Significant Discrepancy in long-term suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs **(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))**		
	LEA	**State Target**
Did the LEA have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs for the 2012–2013 reporting year?	No	≤5.58%
Did the LEA have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, for the 2012–2013 reporting year?	No	**0.00%**

Indicator 5: Least Restrictive Environment **(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**	**LEA**	**State Target**
What was the percent of children with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day?	66.67%	≥56%
What was the percent of children with IEPs inside the general education class less than 40% of the day?	0.00%	≤15.45%
What was the percent of children with IEPs in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements?	0.00%	≤2.19%

SOUTH CAROLINA
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION

Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

ZONE THREE OUTCOMES – John de la Howe
DOES THE LEA IMPLEMENT IDEA TO IMPROVE SERVICES AND RESULTS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES?

	LEA	State Target
Indicator 8: **What was the 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)).** **NOTE: YEAR THE LEA WAS SAMPLED WAS:**	N/S	≥31.43%
Indicator 9**: Did the LEA have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification? (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(C))**	No	**0.00%**
Indicator 10**: Did the LEA have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability a category that was the result of inappropriate identification? (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(C))**	No	**0.00%**
Indicator 11**: What was the percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation? (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))**	100.00%	**100%**

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

ZONE FOUR OUTCOMES – John de la Howe
ARE YOUTH WITH DISABILITIES PREPARED FOR LIFE, WORK, AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION?

	LEA	State Target
Indicator 1: **What was the percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma? (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**	NR%	≥78%
Indicator 2: **What was percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school? (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**	0%	≤ 4.8%
Indicator 13: **Was the district compliant in the number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are 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? (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))** **NOTE: THE YEAR THE LEA WAS MONITORED WAS 2010 - 2011.**	Yes	**100%**
	LEA Baseline	**State Baseline**
Indicator 14: **What was the percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))**		
A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school?	0.00%	24.86%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school?	0.00%	50.73%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school?	0.00%	66.42%

Special Education LEA Profile
2012 – 2013 Reporting Year

REPORT NOTES

REPORT NOTE: NR indicates that no data were reported or collected at the State or LEA level. Greater than or equal to is designated by ≥ and less than or equal to is designated by ≤.

Indicator 7 Data Source: LEA Data Submission (July 2012 for the 2012 – 2013 Reporting Year)
Indicator 12 Data Source: State Data Excent© Extraction (July 2013 for the 2012 – 2013 Reporting Year)

NOTE: NA indicates that the LEA had either no Part C (Baby-Net) children referred or no children from Part C were determined eligible under Part B.

Indicator 6 Data Source: Table 3 (Environment)(December 2012)
Indicator 3 Data Source: Comprehensive State Performance Report (an ESEA Requirement) for 2012 – 2013
Indicator 4 Data Source: Table 5 (Discipline **for 2011–2012, July 2012 LEA submission**) and LEA Self-Assessment Rubric submission
Indicator 5 Data Source: Table 3 (Environment) (December 2012)
Indicator 8 Data Source: Parent Involvement Survey to sampled LEAs, based upon a stratified, random sampling plan outlined in the State Performance Plan. For more information, please consult the South Carolina IDEA State Performance Plan.

NOTE 1: The state target is reflective of the state target for the year in which the LEA was sampled.

Indicator 9 Data Source: Table 1 (Child Count) (December 2012) and Self-Assessment Rubric and Folder Review (Summer 2013)
Indicator 10 Data Source: Table 1 (Child Count) (December 2012) and Self-Assessment Rubric and Folder Review (Summer 2013)
Indicator 11 Data Source: State Data Excent© Extraction (July 2013 for the 2012 – 2013 Reporting Year)
Indicator 1Data Source: Comprehensive State Performance Report (an ESEA Requirement) **for 2011 – 2012**
Indicator 2 Data Source: Comprehensive State Performance Report (an ESEA Requirement) **for 2011 – 2012**
Indicator 13 Data Source: Onsite Monitoring Results (July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013)
Indicator 14 Data Source: Post-school Survey (Summer 2013)