



Ohio's 2023 Special Education Rating Process

Annually, the Ohio Department of Education issues a rating on the performance of the special education program for each district and community school in the state. This is known as the Special Education Rating and meets federal requirements for local education agencies that receive IDEA funding (Section 300.600(a)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)).

The district rating evaluates the implementation of federal requirements, also called compliance measures, as well as results for students with disabilities. The rating is one of the following:

- Meets Requirements
- Needs Assistance
- Needs Intervention
- Needs Substantial Intervention

Districts submit final special education program data through Ohio's Education Management Information System (EMIS). The Department used the data for the 2021-2022 school year to create each district's Special Education Profile. These data are the basis for the 2023 rating.

Rating Criteria

The 2023 rating assesses districts' performance on the following compliance measures from the 2022-2023 Special Education Profile:

- Discipline discrepancies by race (Indicator 4b)
- Disproportionality in identification into special education and specific disability categories (Indicators 9 & 10)
- Initial evaluation timelines (Indicator 11)
- Early childhood transition (Indicator 12)
- Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13)
- Timely correction of noncompliance (Indicator 15)

The following compliance measures are also included:

- Timely and accurate data reporting (Indicator 20)
- Special education audit findings

Future ratings will also include:

- Graduation rate for students with disabilities (Indicator 1)
- Dropout rate for students with disabilities (Indicator 2)

Enforcement Actions

The IDEA Part B regulations at §300.600(a) specifically designate the enforcement actions that states must apply after a district is determined "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years, "Needs Intervention" for three or more consecutive years, or immediately when a district is determined "Needs Substantial Intervention."

The table below displays the enforcement actions required by the Department for ratings other than "Meets Requirements." In some cases, no action is required because the issues lowering the district's rating have been addressed via required actions in the Special Education Profile.



Category	Enforcement Actions
Needs Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the 2023-2024 Special Education Profile to review indicator data. • Inform districts of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources. • Require a district self-review and improvement plan to address compliance and student results indicator(s) with lower scores.
Needs Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the 2023-2024 Special Education Profile to review indicator data. • Inform districts of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources. • Require a district self-review and improvement plan to address compliance and student results indicator(s) with lower scores. • Refer to the Office for Exceptional Children’s Supports & Monitoring team for an IDEA Monitoring Review if one is not already ongoing.
Needs Substantial Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the 2023-2024 Special Education Profile to review indicator data. • Inform districts of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources. • Refer to the Office for Exceptional Children’s Supports & Monitoring team for an IDEA Monitoring Review if one is not already ongoing. • Withhold, in whole or in part, any Part B funds and require completion of specific corrective actions before release of funds in alignment with the Department’s System of Progressive Sanctions, Ohio Revised Code (ORC §3317.01), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), and federal regulations at 34 C.F.R. Part 300. • Require intensive SST support.

The maintenance of effort provisions of IDEA §300.203(b) require school districts to maintain (or increase) the amount of local, or state and local, funds spent for the education of children with disabilities when compared to the preceding fiscal year. When specific criteria are met within a given fiscal year, districts have the flexibility to reduce their maintenance of effort. According to IDEA §300.205(c), this flexibility is not available to districts receiving annual Special Education Ratings other than “Meets Requirements.”

New to the 2023 Special Education Rating

The 2023 Special Education Rating includes a preview of the changes that will take effect with the 2024 report. This preview shows what each district’s rating would be if measures of student results were included in 2023. This preview is known as the projected rating. The projected rating combines the current eight measures of procedural compliance with two measures of students’ results: graduation rate (indicator 1) and dropout rate (indicator 2). The projected rating will be the calculation for the 2024 Special Education Rating.

Calculating the Special Education Rating

Actual 2023 Special Education Rating

To determine each district’s actual rating, the Department totals the points across the compliance measures and divides that total by the number of measures for which the district has data. The total number of measures can be up to eight and not every district has data for every measure each year. This is the **compliance score**. The 2023 Special Education Rating is based entirely on compliance indicators. The 2023 Special Education



Rating also accounts for the completion of monitoring for the 2022-2023 Special Education Profile. The criteria for each rating is shown in the table below.

2023 Actual Rating	Criteria
Meets Requirements	Compliance score of 3.75 – 4.00
Needs Assistance (Year 1)	Compliance score of 3.00 – 3.74
Needs Assistance (Year 2)	LEA must meet both of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compliance score of 3.00 – 3.74; AND• Rating of <i>Needs Assistance</i> for 2 consecutive years
Needs Intervention	LEA must meet at least one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compliance score of 1.25 – 2.99; OR• Rating of <i>Needs Assistance</i> for 3 or more consecutive years; OR• Failure to complete the indicator monitoring process by the systemic improvement deadline; OR• Continued noncompliance (defined as two or more consecutive years of uncorrected noncompliance)
Needs Substantial Intervention	LEA must meet at least one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compliance score of 0.00 – 1.24; OR• Rating of <i>Needs Intervention</i> for 3 or more consecutive years



Indicator 4b: Discipline Discrepancy by Race

Indicator 4b measures significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) *and* policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

Target

The target for Indicator 4b is a risk ratio less than or equal to 2.50 for three consecutive years.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 EMIS year-end discipline and enrollment files, calculated to identify districts with significant discrepancies.

Notes

The measurement for Indicator 4b requires the following two steps:

- 1) The Department identifies significant discipline discrepancies in districts with risk ratios greater than 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30.
- 2) Districts with significant discipline discrepancies complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding records, the Department determines if the district has policies, procedures or practices that do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

Points for Indicator 4b are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 4b Points	Criteria
4	District does not have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs <i>and</i> policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.
1	District has a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs <i>and</i> policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.
NC	District does not meet the minimum cell size of 10 or n-size of 30.
NR	District has zero students in the racial or ethnic subgroup.



Indicators 9 and 10: Significant Disproportionality in Special Education Identification

Indicators 9 and 10 measure disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups into special education and related services across all disability categories (Indicator 9) and specific disability categories (Indicator 10) that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Target

The target for Indicators 9 and 10 is a risk ratio less than or equal to 2.50 for three consecutive years.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 EMIS year-end enrollment files, calculated to identify districts with significant risk ratios.

Notes

The measurement for Indicators 9 and 10 requires the following two steps:

- 1) The Department identifies significant disproportionality either across disability categories or within specific disability categories in districts with risk ratios greater than 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30.
- 2) Districts with significant disproportionality complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding records, the Department determines if the significant disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification.

Points for Indicators 9 and 10 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicators 9 and 10 Points	Criteria
4	District does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (either across disability categories or within specific disability categories).
1	District has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (either across disability categories or within specific disability categories).
NC	District does not meet the minimum cell size of 10 or n-size of 30.
NR	District has zero students in the racial or ethnic subgroup.



Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations

Indicator 11 measures the percentage of children who were evaluated within 60 calendar days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

Target

The target for Indicator 11 is 100 percent.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2021-2022 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.

Notes

There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one initial evaluation in 2021-2022 receive a score for Indicator 11.

Points for Indicator 11 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 11 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94.99%
2	50 – 74.99%
1	0 – 49.99%
NR	0 students with initial evaluations in 2021-2022



Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B

Indicator 12 measures the percentage of children referred to Part C (early intervention services) prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B (preschool services), and who have an IEP implemented by their third birthdays.

Target

The target for Indicator 12 is 100 percent.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2021-2022 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.

Notes

There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one student transition from Part C to Part B in 2021-2022 receive a score for Indicator 12.

Points for Indicator 12 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 12 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94.99%
2	50 – 74.99%
1	0 – 49.99%
NR	0 students transitioning from Part C to Part B in 2021-2022



Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Indicator 13 measures the percentage of youth with IEPs age 16 or older with an IEP that includes:

- 1) Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment;
- 2) Transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals;
- 3) Annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs;
- 4) Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed; and
- 5) Evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Target

The target for Indicator 13 is 100 percent.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2021-2022 EMIS year-end enrollment files and the Special Education Event Record.

Notes

- There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one student with a disability age 16 or above in 2021-2022 receive a score for Indicator 13.
- Although transition planning and services are required beginning at age 14 in Ohio, the federal indicator is specific to students with disabilities age 16 and above.

Points for Indicator 13 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 13 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94.99%
2	50 – 74.99%
1	0 – 49.99%
NR	0 students with disabilities of transition age in 2021-2022



Indicator 15: Timely Correction of Noncompliance

Indicator 15 measures timely correction of noncompliance and reflects whether the district corrected all findings of noncompliance within the timelines established by the Department.

Target

The target for Indicator 15 is no late/uncorrected findings.

Data Source

Findings of noncompliance are identified from:

- IDEA monitoring;
- Profile monitoring (Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13);
- Fiscal reviews;
- Selective reviews;
- Complaints; and
- Due process hearings.

Notes

Indicator 15 is specific to findings made in 2020-2021 and due for correction in 2021-2022.

Points for Indicator 15 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 15 Points	Criteria
4	District corrected all identified noncompliance within timelines or did not receive a finding of noncompliance.
1	District did not correct all identified noncompliance within established timelines.



Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data

Indicator 20 measures whether district-reported data are timely and accurate.

Target

The target for Indicator 20 is no data issues.

Data Source

Timely and accurate data reporting is evaluated for:

- 1) Graduation rate (Indicator 1);
- 2) Dropout rate (Indicator 2);
- 3) Suspensions and expulsions (Indicator 4);
- 4) Disproportionality (Identification (Indicators 9 and 10), Placement, Discipline);
- 5) Initial evaluations (Indicator 11);
- 6) Early childhood transition (Indicator 12);
- 7) Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13);
- 8) Alternate assessment participation; and
- 9) Other EMIS data reported for students with disabilities.

Notes

Data are considered inaccurate if student records or other documentation do not match the data reported in EMIS, as determined through reviews completed by the Department.

Points for Indicator 20 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 20 Points	Criteria
4	All data are timely and accurate.
3	One component of 1-9 (above) is not timely or accurate.
2	Two components of 1-9 (above) are not timely or accurate.
1	Three or more components of 1-9 (above) are not timely or accurate.



IDEA Audit Findings

IDEA audit findings measure the severity of audit findings during the 2021-2022 school year.

Target

No audit findings.

Data Source

Single audits conducted by the Ohio Auditor of State's Office during the 2021-2022 school year.

Notes

- Scores of less than 4 are assigned to districts with IDEA-related audit findings whose reports were released by the Auditor of State by July 1, 2023.
- See [Ohio's Special Education Ratings webpage](#) for examples of minor, moderate and major audit findings.

Points for IDEA audit findings are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Audit Points	Criteria
4	No IDEA audit findings
3	Minor monitoring and/or reporting issues which can be easily remedied by implementing procedures according to Uniform Guidance .
2	Moderate documentation and/or reporting issues which would require revision of internal financial processes.
1	Major financial tracking issues which would require the initiation of appropriate financial and accounting procedures.
NR	Not audited in 2021-2022.



Projected 2023 Special Education Rating

The projected rating is based on an average of the compliance score and results score, as well as the final results of the indicator monitoring process for the 2022-2023 Special Education Profile. To determine the overall score, the Department:

- 1) Totals the points across the compliance measures and divides that total by the number of compliance measures for which the district has data. The total number of compliance measures can be up to eight and not every district has data for every measure each year. This is the **compliance score**.
- 2) Totals the points across results measures and divides that total by the number of results measures for which the district has data. The total number of results measures can be up to two. This is the **results score**.
- 3) Calculates an average of the compliance score and results score to determine the **overall score**.

The overall score corresponds to a point range for each rating category. The 2023 projected rating also accounts for the completion of monitoring for the 2022-2023 Special Education Profile. The criteria for each projected rating is shown in the table below.

2023 Projected Rating	Criteria
Meets Requirements	Average of Compliance and Results scores of 3.75 – 4.00
Needs Assistance (Year 1)	Average of Compliance and Results scores of 3.00 – 3.74
Needs Assistance (Year 2)	LEA must meet both of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of Compliance and Results scores of 3.00 – 3.74; AND • Rating of <i>Needs Assistance</i> for 2 consecutive years
Needs Intervention	LEA must meet at least one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of Compliance and Results scores of 1.25 – 2.99; OR • Rating of <i>Needs Assistance</i> for 3 or more consecutive years; OR • Failure to complete the indicator monitoring process by the systemic improvement deadline; OR • Continued noncompliance (defined as two or more consecutive years of uncorrected noncompliance)
Needs Substantial Intervention	LEA must meet at least one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of Compliance and Results scores of 0.00 – 1.24; OR • Rating of <i>Needs Intervention</i> for 3 or more consecutive years



Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

Indicator 1 measures the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities.

Target

The target for Indicator 1 is 62 percent or greater.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS year-end Student Standing, Special Education Event, Special Education Graduation, Assessment, and Student Detail files.

Notes

- Beginning with the 2019-2020 data, the graduation rate calculation reflects the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities, divided by the total number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education.
- Students with disabilities taking alternate assessments, excused from consequences of standard high school assessments or graduating by meeting their IEP goals are included in the total number of youth with IEPs who left special education (the denominator) but not the number of youth with IEPs who graduated with a regular high school diploma (the numerator) for this calculation. These students are not counted as graduates as required for this calculation.
- Points for Indicator 1 are assigned to districts based on the distance from the target.
 - Districts who meet or exceed the target receive 4 points.
 - Districts who are at or above the average of those who missed the target receive 3 points.
 - From there, points are assigned based on standard deviation from the mean. Standard deviation provides a measure of how much performance varies across the state in relation to the target.
 - Districts within one standard deviation below the mean receive 2 points.
 - Districts who are one to two standard deviations below the mean receive 1 point.
 - Districts who are more than two standard deviations below the mean (e.g., a 0% graduation rate) receive zero points.
 - Districts with fewer than 10 total students with disabilities ages 14-21 exiting special education in 2021-2022 by (a) Graduating with a regular high school diploma; (b) Graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) Receiving a certificate; (d) Reaching maximum age; or (e) Dropping out, do not receive a score for this indicator. These districts will receive “NR” for not reported.
- Graduation rate is not yet included in the actual ratings calculation and is offered for continuous improvement planning. Graduation rate is only included in the 2023 projected rating. Future ratings will include graduation rate.
- For more information on how targets were set for this indicator, see the [Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage](#).



Points for Indicator 1 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 1 Points	Criteria
4	≥62.00%
3	43.33% – 61.99%
2	27.88% – 43.32%
1	12.42% – 27.87%
0	0.00% – 12.41%
NR	<10 students with disabilities exiting special education in 2020-2021



Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

Indicator 2 measures the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to dropping out.

Target

The target for Indicator 2 is 16 percent or less.

Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS year-end Student Standing, Special Education Event, Special Education Graduation, and Student Detail files.

Notes

- Beginning with the 2015-2016 data, the dropout rate calculation reflects the number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to dropping out, divided by the total number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education.
- Points for Indicator 2 are assigned to districts based on the distance from the target.
 - Districts who are at or below the target receive 4 points.
 - Districts who are at or below the average of those who missed the target receive 3 points.
 - From there, points are assigned based on standard deviation from the mean. Standard deviation provides a measure of how much performance varies across the state in relation to the target.
 - Districts within one standard deviation above the mean receive 2 points.
 - Districts who are one to two standard deviations above the mean receive 1 point.
 - Districts who are more than two standard deviations above the mean (e.g., a 100% dropout rate) receive zero points.
 - Districts with fewer than 10 total students with disabilities ages 14-21 exiting special education in 2021-2022 by (a) Graduating with a regular high school diploma; (b) Graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) Receiving a certificate; (d) Reaching maximum age; or (e) Dropping out, do not receive a score for this indicator. These districts will receive “NR” for not reported.
- Dropout rate is not yet included in the actual ratings calculation and is offered for continuous improvement planning. Dropout rate is only included in the 2023 projected rating. Future ratings will include dropout rate.
- For more information on how targets were set for this indicator, see the [Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage](#).

Points for Indicator 2 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

Indicator 2 Points	Criteria
4	≤16.00%
3	16.01% - 35.40%
2	35.41% - 55.14%
1	55.15% - 74.87%
0	74.88% - 100.00%
NR	<10 students with disabilities exiting special education in 2020-2021



Ensure Data Security

Each district is responsible for managing the security and local access to its rating report data. The data provided are for district use only and are NOT masked. Reports may contain information for group sizes of fewer than 10 students. Reports are not intended for public distribution. Districts should observe their local policies for security of unmasked data.

Appeals Process

Districts wishing to appeal their ratings must submit a completed appeal form and supporting documentation by **January 12, 2024**. Districts or schools considering an appeal may contact the Department at determinations@education.ohio.gov.

Public Reporting

The Ohio Department of Education reports annually to the public on the performance of each district's special education program, including their Special Education Indicator Data and Special Education Rating, on the Department's [website](#). The Department will add the 2023 ratings to the *District-Level Special Education Indicator Data* report after the appeals period has concluded.