

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part C**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**

South Carolina



PART C DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Effective July 1, 2017, lead agency responsibilities for the South Carolina system of early intervention, known as "BabyNet," transitioned from South Carolina First Steps to School Readiness (SCFSSR) to the South Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (SCDHHS) pursuant to Executive Order 2016-20, issued by Governor Nikki R. Haley on Sept. 14, 2016.

Since transferring to SCDHHS, the BabyNet program began focusing on integration into the Medicaid agency in the areas of provider enrollment and payer policy, coordination of benefits with the Medicaid Managed Care Organizations (MCO), and the integration of the BabyNet Reporting & Intervention Data Gathering Electronic System (BRIDGES) case management system and the state's Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS). In early 2018, the state negotiated a voluntarily detailed Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that outlined the actions that needed to take place to bring the program into compliance. The effective date of the CAP was July 1, 2018. The areas of focus for the CAP included; General Supervision, Data Quality, Fiscal Compliance, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019, an enormous amount of work took place in these and other areas. Some of the accomplishments of the BabyNet team are outlined below:

Referral and Intake:

- Completion of an online webform for families and professionals to refer children to the program in June 2019. To date more than 10,997 referrals have been processed through the form.
- Directed referrals for 14 of 17 local offices through a centralized referral team (CRT). These staff were hired to standardize the process of initial contacts with families. There were initially 5 CRT staff and there are now 18. These staff are responsible for all centralized program intake scheduling except for three offices in the state.
- SCDHHS has cut the time from referral to evaluation significantly

Payment System Integration:

- Jasper contract was terminated on July 1, 2018 and those functions were incorporated into the BabyNet program.
- Direct enrollment of SCDDSN and SCSDB providers with Medicaid
- The addition of new CPT codes to delineate the work performed by service coordinators

Policy and Procedure Work:

- Submitted Phase II of SSIP timely
- Posted BabyNet Policy and Procedure Manual

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Prior to 2019, South Carolina's IDEA Part C program had not implemented a system of general supervision of the provider network or the performance of individual providers. As part of the CAP negotiated with OSEP in 2018, SCDHHS developed an early intervention system monitoring structure and has now implemented a system of general supervision and issued its first findings of noncompliance in late 2019.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

South Carolina has a robust system of technical assistance available to its provider network, including an electronic help desk system that allows providers to submit questions to BabyNet state staff. These questions are answered by 4 state-level staff who all are supervised by the Part C Operations Manager. This structure helps ensure consistency of messages and coordination of timely responses. These same staff are responsible for monthly meetings with the providers at the local level. These meetings can be used for training and technical assistance as well as to discuss developments in their community that impact service delivery. Service Coordination providers also have an added layer of training and technical assistance as they can contact the program manager within their respective agencies. During 2018-2019, the program sent out frequent (sometimes weekly) email alerts coupled with a series of webinars to communicate upcoming changes with the provider community.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

In May 2019, SCDHHS facilitated the first of four regional Routines-Based Interview (RBI) trainings. This training will lead to RBI state certification for service coordinators and will assist the state in becoming compliant in the area of family assessment, which has historically been an area of non-compliance for South Carolina. As a requirement of the CAP, the BabyNet program worked during 2018-2019 to develop a comprehensive policy and procedure manual. In depth training on the new manual is set to begin in Spring of 2020 and will include both virtual and face-to-face delivery options. This will lead to an overhaul of the content in the learning management system (LMS). This LMS houses and tracks training to all providers as they enter the system and is a way that the state can require additional content be shared with our provider community.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The state solicits input from the provider community through the South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (SCICC) meetings, as well as calls and face-to-face meetings with providers. During the BRIDGES Integration work, state office staff have reached out to groups of providers to solicit their input on potential changes and how they might impact their work.

For the SSIP, the state gathered a group of providers with strong backgrounds in the RBI process to seek guidance from them on how the state should implement the new process with its provider community. State office staff gained valuable information from this group that was used during the initial RBI

training. The BabyNet program also established several email accounts that providers can use to submit questions to state office staff on various topics.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)

NO

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The state solicited input on targets for the APR from members of the SCICC as well as other interested stakeholders. Copies of the APR are posted on the BabyNet website: (<https://msp.scdhhs.gov/babynet/>). Information regarding changes that were occurring during the BRIDGES Integration project were shared through alerts and bulletins sent out by the lead agency to the provider community. A list of those alerts can be found at: <https://msp.scdhhs.gov/babynet/site-page/announcements>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	95.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.32%	NVR	32.20%	40.63%	40.25%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,224	7,081	40.25%	100%	59.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

The South Carolina early intervention system defines timely receipt as initiation of all new IFSP services within 30 calendar days of parent signature on the plan.

With the transition of the BabyNet program to SC Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in FFY 2017, work began immediately to address South Carolina's longstanding issues with missing and invalid data for Indicator 1. Those efforts included the activities associated with the BabyNet Reporting and Intervention Data Gathering Electronic System (BRIDGES) integration project as well as intense work with the Data Governance Office (DGO) at DHHS. The efforts were further supported by the hiring of a Part C Data Manager in February 2019 as well as the ongoing work at the local level by four state Regional Part C Coordinators. These coordinators meet monthly with local stakeholders from early intervention/service coordination companies, school district personnel, the provider community and other interested parties to discuss various aspects of the local service delivery system. One consistent topic of discussion is data clean-up, especially as it relates to Indicator 1.

State staff in the BabyNet program have also been working closely with representatives from the DGO to examine the data contained in the BRIDGES system as well as the "canned" reports it produces. After a thorough analysis, the DGO determined that the reports available in the system were not accurately capturing the information necessary to produce valid and reliable data and reports for Indicator 1. It was at that point that the DGO began using the data it receives from a secure daily file transfer from BRIDGES to DHHS to develop and run the data for Indicator 1. As reported in South Carolina's progress report on October 1, 2019, the data is looking better than what had been reported by BRIDGES and we are now confident that it is valid and reliable. The following is a summary of the how the DGO generated this report.

- Identify planned services with an origination date within the reporting period
- Link planned services to service delivery records and calculate the number of days between service origination and the first time a service was delivered.
- Services delivered on or before day 30 are considered timely. Any services after day 30 or not delivered are marked as untimely.
- Exclude services not required for indicator 1, services assigned within 1 month of child's 3rd birthday, and services with a family-related delay reason.
- If services share a discipline ID, count all services as timely if at least one service in discipline is timely.
- Group all disciplines by child and determine child timeliness. If at least one discipline is untimely, then the child is marked untimely.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

We consider our calculations to be valid because we have built data structures and linked the data structures based upon business needs. The calculations are reliable because the data structures are based upon business rules and not internal system IDs, the requirements are well known and the methodology is repeatable.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2015	56	0	56

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

In the past, South Carolina has had numerous issues with identifying noncompliance, notifying providers when it occurred and following up to ensure correction when concerns were identified. Under the previous lead agency, the state did not have a coordinated system of general supervision that was developed, implemented and communicated at all levels within the program or stakeholders. For these reasons, South Carolina is unable to correct findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2015 as the state is unable to verify that those instances were ever formally issued to the providers. In addition, these instances are unable to be corrected now due to these children no longer being enrolled in the Part C program. As part of the corrective action plan negotiated with The US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in 2018, SCDHHS agreed to implement a system of general supervision and provider oversight. As a result, South Carolina issued it's first formal findings of non-compliance in late 2019.

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2017. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	86.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	99.00%	99.00%	97.64%	97.64%	97.64%
Data	99.40%	NVR	97.64%	97.33%	97.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	98.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (SCICC) and interested members of the public met and made the decision to set the 2019 target at the same level as the 2018 target. It is the desire of the SCICC members to examine the three year trend before it looks at changing targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,373
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,481

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,373	5,481	97.82%	98.00%	98.03%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council met and made the decision to set the 2019 target at the same level as the 2018 target. It is the desire of the SCICC members to examine the three year trend before it looks at changing targets.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target>=	80.00%	80.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%
A1	80.00%	Data	79.56%	79.86%	78.40%	78.17%	77.07%
A2	2013	Target>=	59.00%	59.00%	54.00%	54.00%	54.00%
A2	59.25%	Data	59.25%	53.46%	53.99%	50.70%	52.03%
B1	2008	Target>=	82.00%	82.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%
B1	82.00%	Data	80.53%	81.90%	80.99%	81.68%	79.48%
B2	2013	Target>=	54.00%	54.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
B2	54.54%	Data	54.54%	49.94%	49.94%	47.54%	48.13%
C1	2008	Target>=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
C1	82.00%	Data	82.01%	81.90%	81.51%	80.28%	78.04%
C2	2013	Target>=	57.00%	57.00%	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%
C2	57.71%	Data	57.71%	53.63%	51.74%	49.43%	50.02%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	80.10%	80.10%
Target A2>=	60.00%	60.00%
Target B1>=	82.10%	82.10%
Target B2>=	55.00%	55.00%
Target C1>=	82.10%	82.10%
Target C2>=	58.00%	58.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

3,358

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	87	2.59%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	646	19.25%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	965	28.75%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,131	33.70%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	527	15.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,096	2,829	77.07%	80.10%	74.09%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,658	3,356	52.03%	60.00%	49.40%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance an quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. The lead agency will be incorporating the Child Outcome Summary process in upcoming policy and procedures training.

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance an quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. The lead agency will be incorporating the Child Outcome Summary process in upcoming policy and procedures training.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	74	2.20%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	567	16.89%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,156	34.44%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,254	37.35%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	306	9.12%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,410	3,051	79.48%	82.10%	78.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,560	3,357	48.13%	55.00%	46.47%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance an quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. The lead agency will be incorporating the Child Outcome Summary process in upcoming policy and procedures training.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	65	1.94%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	626	18.69%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,034	30.87%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,241	37.04%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	384	11.46%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,275	2,966	78.04%	82.10%	76.70%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,625	3,350	50.02%	58.00%	48.51%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance an quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. The lead agency will be incorporating the Child Outcome Summary process in upcoming policy and procedures training.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance an quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. The lead agency will be incorporating the Child Outcome Summary process in upcoming policy and procedures training.

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

XXX

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

B2	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	
Target A2 >=	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B1 >=	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B2 >=	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C1 >=	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C2 >=	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	4,779
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	1,157

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

- *Batelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-2)
- *The Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs (CCITSN), Third Edition (birth to 24 months) or
- * The Carolina Curriculum for Preschoolers with Special Needs (CCITSN), Second Edition (24-60 months)
- *The Hawaii Early Learning Profile (0-3)
- * Service Provider documentation of evaluation, assessment and service delivery

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2012	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%
A	86.00%	Data	91.67%	85.91%	74.06%	63.21%	65.07%
B	2012	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
B	86.00%	Data	90.91%	81.82%	72.18%	61.02%	60.63%
C	2017	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
C	70.18%	Data	92.36%	87.73%	75.94%	64.63%	70.18%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	74.00%	74.00%
Target B >=	72.00%	72.00%
Target C >=	75.10%	75.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (SCICC) and interested members of the public met and made the decision to set the 2019 target at the same level as the 2018 target. It is the desire of the SCICC members to examine the three year trend before it looks at changing targets.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	2,380
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	338
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	182
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	288
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	185
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	286
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	206
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	284

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	65.07%	74.00%	63.19%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	60.63%	72.00%	64.69%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	70.18%	75.10%	72.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

When the lead agency changed in 2017, SCDHHS identified many efforts that needed to begin in order to improve compliance and quality. New policy, procedures and forms along with data system integration were among the highest priority efforts identified by the new lead agency. Other identified efforts include an updated Family Outcomes Measurements System and a new family assessment process. These efforts are included as coherent improvement strategies in the state's SSIP. These new efforts will be implemented in the current fiscal year, so the state expects to see improvements in response rates and results for indicator 4 in the next few years' APRs.

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
If your collection tool has changed, upload it here	XXX
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	NO

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The state will focus on updating the entire Family Outcomes Measurement System, including dissemination practices. These strategies will be reported in the upcoming SSIP report.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

The collected data is representative of SC IDEA Part C eligible population in FFY 2017-2018, with a 95% confidence level with a +/- 5.16 confidence interval based on the population of 5481 children and families. One of the coherent improvement strategies was developed to address South Carolina's SIMR, is to focus on the Family Outcomes Measurement System. This strategy includes dissemination practices and improving response rates.

Race/Ethnicity Number and Percent of All Families of Infants and Toddlers Served by IDEA/Part C in South Carolina

Hispanic/Latino: 536, 9.77%
American Indian or Alaska Native: 8, 0.14%
Total Asian: 53, 0.99%
Total Black or African American: 1638, 29.89%
Total Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 17, 0.30%
Total White: 2972, 54.22%
Total Two or More Races: 257, 4.69%
Total: 5481, 100%

Percent of Families of Infants and Toddlers Responding to Family Outcomes Survey

Hispanic/Latino: 31, 9.17%
American Indian or Alaska Native: 3, 0.89%
Total Asian: 11, 3.25%
Total Black or African American: 67, 19.82%
Total Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 2, 0.59%
Total White: 208, 61.54%
Total Two or More Races: 16, 4.73%
Total: 338, 100%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.92%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.84%	0.89%	0.74%	0.95%	0.98%
Data	0.79%	0.66%	0.74%	0.95%	0.89%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.92%	0.92%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (SCICC) met and made the decision to set the 2019 target at the same level as the 2018 target. It is the desire of the SCICC members to examine the three year trend before it looks at changing targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	547
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	55,932

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
547	55,932	0.89%	0.92%	0.98%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The national data for birth to one year reflects 1.25% of infants and toddlers receive Part C services. This percentage is lower in South Carolina and the state contributes this difference to South Carolina's restrictive eligibility criteria.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	2.07%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.24%	2.13%	2.30%	2.49%	2.49%
Data	2.13%	2.12%	2.30%	2.49%	2.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.50%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council (SCICC) and interested members of the public met and made the decision to set the 2019 target at the same level as the 2018 target. It is the desire of the SCICC members to examine the three year trend before it looks at changing targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,481
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	172,303

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,481	172,303	2.82%	2.50%	3.18%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The national data for birth to one year reflects 3.26% of infants and toddlers receive Part C services. This percentage is lower in South Carolina and the state contributes the difference to South Carolina's restrictive eligibility criteria.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	97.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	81.85%	65.16%	72.40%	83.46%	83.25%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,814	5,670	83.25%	100%	67.90%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In working on this particular year's Indicator 7, it was determined that incorrect logic was built into the BRIDGES system. Per the instructions in EMAPS, the late IFSPs due to a family reason should be added to both the numerator and the denominator. This calculation did not occur and inflated the percentage of timely IFSPs reported in previous years. The DGO caught this error and we shared the information with the BRIDGES developer and he confirmed the incorrect calculation within the BRIDGES system. We do not believe that this slippage is due to increased noncompliance, but simply an artifact of the BRIDGES system's error in calculations.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

We consider our calculations to be valid because we have built data structures and linked the data structures based upon business needs. The calculations are reliable because the data structures are based upon business rules and not internal system IDs, the requirements are well known and the methodology is repeatable.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2015	35	0	35

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

In the past, South Carolina has had numerous issues with identifying noncompliance, notifying providers when it occurred and following up to ensure correction when concerns were identified. Under the previous lead agency, the state did not have a coordinated system of general supervision that was developed, implemented and communicated at all levels within the program or stakeholders. For these reasons, South Carolina is unable to correct findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2015 as the state is unable to verify that those instances were ever formally issued to the providers. In addition, these instances are unable to be corrected now due to these children no longer being enrolled in the Part C program. As part of the corrective action plan negotiated with The US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in 2018, SCDHHS agreed to implement a system of general supervision and provider oversight. As a result, South Carolina issued it's first formal findings of non-compliance in late 2019.

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	70.94%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,659	4,659	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The BRIDGES system requires transition planning with the initial IFSP and with each subsequent 6 month review or evaluation of the IFSP. Service coordinators cannot save the IFSP in the data system without a completed transition plan. The number of children reported for FFY 2018 excludes 469 children whose initial IFSP was developed within 90 days of the child's third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,969	4,969	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Using the data from the BRIDGES data system, the staff at the Team for Early Childhood Solutions (TECS) sends data reports on a monthly basis to the SEA and each of the state's LEAs as follows:

1. "24 month report" from BRIDGES of children who turned 24 months (2 years) of age in the previous month and for whom an initial IFSP was developed.
2. "Over 24 month report" from BRIDGES of children who were 24 months (2 years) of age during the previous month and for whom an initial IFSP was developed.
3. "30 month report" from BRIDGES of children who turned 30 months (2.5 years) of age and for whom an initial IFSP was developed at age 30 months during the previous month.
4. "Over 33 month report" from BRIDGES of children with an initial IFSP developed between the age of 33 months (2 years 9 months) and 34.5 months (2 years 10.5 months); and
5. "Over 34.5 month report" from BRIDGES of children referred to BabyNet over 34.5 months of age in the assigned geographic area.

Each report includes directory information (child's name, date of birth, address and telephone number) for children in the assigned geographic area for the LEA. If no children in a school district qualify for notification, a "zero report" is made which notifies the South Carolina Department of Education and the LEA that there are no children to report in the specific month range.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Because the notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and each Local Education Agency (LEA) is completed electronically as described above, the state has ensured 100% compliance with Indicator 8b. The number of children reported for FFY 2018 excludes 159 children whose initial IFSP was developed within 45 days of the child's third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	93.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.06%	84.72%	96.47%	85.97%	90.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,448	3,565	90.50%	100%	91.69%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

507

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

356

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

With the monthly data reminders for missing and/or invalid data, service coordinators have been responsive to requests to enter both transition and exit data in BRIDGES, including instances when parents decline the transition conference process and when the conference was delayed due to parent reasons. Part B and Part C have collaborated on a number of projects and communicate frequently with each other at the state and local level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2015	5	0	5

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

South Carolina is unable to correct findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2015 as the state is unable to verify that those instances were ever formally issued to the providers. In addition, these instances are unable to be corrected now due to these children no longer being enrolled in the program. As part of the corrective action plan negotiated with The US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in 2018, SCDHHS agreed to implement a system of general supervision and provider oversight. As a result, South Carolina issued it's first formal findings of non-compliance in late 2019.

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Historical Data

Baseline					
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

South Carolina reported a total of 3 complaints in FFY 2017. One was withdrawn or dismissed; two were investigated, and reports issued within required timelines. Neither rose to the level of a resolution session or settlement agreement. All complaints involved issues about access to or timeliness of services.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

JENNIFER BUSTER

Title:

Part C Director

Email:

Jennifer.Buster@scdhhs.gov

Phone:

803-898-3068

Submitted on:

02/03/20 4:51:31 PM