Special Education LEA Profile
2010 – 2011 Reporting Year

ANDERSON 2

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 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) by continuing to ensure that each student is provided a free appropriate public education. To accomplish this task, the IDEA authorized funding to states and local education agencies (LEAs), along with outlining specific ways of measuring students' progress in special education.

As part of the IDEA requirements, 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 local (LEA) levels. In these SPPs, 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.

Also as part of the IDEA requirements, states are required to report annually to the public on the progress made by states against the state targets found in the SPPs. These Annual Performance Reports (APRs) describe states' progress through twenty indicators, as well as whether or not states achieve the rigorous targets established in the SPP. South Carolina's current APR may be found at http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/173/documents/REV4-12FFY2010-AnnualPerformReport.pdf.

Finally, as part of the IDEA requirements, states are required to publicly report the performance of each LEA with regards to the applicable indicators described in the SPP. 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 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 each LEA's outcomes are compared to 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, Office of Exceptional Children, at www.ed.sc.gov .

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."

Special Education LEA Profile
2010 – 2011 Reporting Year

ZONE ONE OUTCOMES – ANDERSON 2
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?	61.54%	≥ 84.69%	70.59%	≥82.36%	57.14%	≥84.72%
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?	75.00%	≥ 70.22%	78.57%	≥62.60%	89.29%	≥82.99%

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))	100.00%	**100%**

Indicator 7 Data Source: LEA Data Submission (July 2011 for the 2010 – 2011 Reporting Year)
Indicator 12 Data Source: State Data Excent© Extraction (July 2011 for the 2010 – 2011 Reporting Year)

REPORT NOTE: N/D indicates that no data were reported or collected at the State or LEA level or no data were available for the indicator calculation. Greater than or equal to is designated by ≥, less than or equal to is designated by ≤, and I/S indicates that the group size was too small to report percentages.

Special Education LEA Profile
2010 – 2011 Reporting Year

ZONE TWO OUTCOMES – ANDERSON 2
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 Adequate Yearly Progress in both English/Language Arts **and** Mathematics**?**	No	≥89%
What was the participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments in English/Language Arts**?**	95.6%	≥95%
What was the participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments in Mathematics**?**	99.7%	≥95%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards in English/Language Arts**?**	48%	≥58.1%
What was the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards in Mathematics**?**	55.5%	≥50.0%

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 2009 – 2010 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 2009 – 2010 reporting year, due to noncompliant policies, procedures, or practices?	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?	80.75%	≥55.31%
What was the percent of children with IEPs inside the general education class less than 40% of the day?	7.52%	≤15.45%
What was the percent of children with IEPs in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements?	0.45%	≤2.19%

Indicator 3 Data Source: AYP for 2010 – 2011 found at http://ed.sc.gov/data/ayp/2011/index.cfm
Indicator 4 Data Source: Table 1 (Child Count) (December 2009), Table 5 (Discipline for 2009 – 2010, July 2010 LEA submission) and LEA Self-Assessment Rubric submission
Indicator 5 Data Source: Table 3 (Environment) (December 2010). **NOTE: Indicator 5C may include children placed in any Residential Treatment Facilities located within the LEA in the calculation.**

Special Education LEA Profile
2010 – 2011 Reporting Year

ZONE THREE OUTCOMES – ANDERSON 2

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: PARENTS IN THE LEA WERE SURVEYED IN 2009 - 2010.**	42.00%	≥30.83%
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 a specific disability 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%**

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: N/S indicates that the LEA has NOT yet been sampled for Indicator 8.

NOTE 2: 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 2010) and Self-Assessment Rubric and Folder Review (Summer 2011)

Indicator 10 Data Source: Table 1 (Child Count) (December 2010) and Self-Assessment Rubric and Folder Review (Summer 2011)

Indicator 11 Data Source: State Data Excent© Extraction (July 2011 for the 2010 – 2011 Reporting Year)

Special Education LEA Profile
2010 – 2011 Reporting Year

ZONE FOUR OUTCOMES – ANDERSON 2
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))**	43.2%	≥45.3%
Indicator 2: **What was percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school? (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**	7.84%	≤ 5.2%
Indicator 13: **What was the percent 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? 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))**	100.00%	**100%**
	LEA	**State Target**
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?	I/S	≥24.36%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school?	I/S	≥50.23%
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?	I/S	≥65.92%

Indicator 1 Data Source: **AYP for 2009 – 2010** found at http://ed.sc.gov/data/ayp/2011/index.cfm
Indicator 2 Data Source: **AYP for 2009 – 2010** found at http://ed.sc.gov/data/ayp/2011/index.cfm
Indicator 13 Data Source: Table 1 (Child Count); LEA Self-Report, State-level Peer Review Monitoring and Appeal Process (December 2010 – June, 2011)
Indicator 14 Data Source: Post-school Survey (Summer 2011). **NOTE: N/R indicates that no surveys were returned from former students for Indicator 14.**