

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Ohio



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**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 students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. 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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

943

General Supervision System:

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

See attachment "Intro - General Supervision"

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 LEAs.

Ohio provides technical assistance and professional development that is linked directly to the indicators and improvement activities established in the SPP/APR. Through this assistance, the Department uses a variety of means, at varying levels of intensity, to build capacity throughout the state.

Ohio's State System of Support

Ohio House Bill 115 established the creation of a coordinated, integrated and aligned regional system to support state and school district efforts to improve school effectiveness and student achievement. ODE awards 16 contracts to Educational Service Centers designated as fiscal agents for the State Support Teams (SSTs) within their geographic regions. The 16 SSTs comprise Ohio's State System of Support.

The goal of the State System of Support is to build the capacity of local and related education agencies to engage in systemic and sustainable improvement that impacts educational outcomes for students. SSTs are integral to implementing and achieving this goal. By providing high quality technical assistance and professional development, SSTs support districts in developing the capacity to fully implement research-based processes and educational practices that result in data based decisions, learning across all levels of the system, and sustained implementation. Through collaboration within and across regions, SSTs access national, state, regional and local agencies and resources to support districts and families.

ODE determines the scope of work for the SSTs, as outlined in an annual grant agreement. SSTs are responsible for the regional delivery of school improvement, special education, and early learning and school readiness services to LEAs. This agreement details specific responsibilities in the work of SSTs with local districts and community schools, organized by priority areas. SSTs provide varying levels of technical assistance and professional development in these areas, based on their districts' SPP/APR performance and indicator data. SSTs use multiple years of indicator data to identify patterns of strengths and weaknesses within each LEA and across LEAs located in their regions. SSTs also provide information, services, and support to parents and families of children with disabilities and those at risk of being identified with disabilities.

In some cases, the Department designates that state support team personnel provide support in priority areas. Areas of priority include Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports as part of a multi-tiered system of support, early language and literacy professional learning and implementation for preschool through grade three, and secondary transition/workforce development. They also support districts in meeting requirements and implementing best practices, aligning efforts statewide in order to improve results for students with disabilities and other underperforming students, including third grade reading performance, graduation rates and post-school outcomes.

At each state support team, consultants provide technical assistance and professional learning to support identified regional priorities related to indicator data, such as least restrictive environment and improving reading and mathematics performance for children with disabilities. State support teams also provide technical assistance and professional learning related to parent and community engagement, support and services for students with autism, sensory disabilities and low-incidence disabilities and assistive technology. State support teams are an integral part of the State System of Support in the delivery of technical assistance and professional learning as it relates to both regulatory requirements and improved outcomes for students.

Specialized Technical Assistance

Multiple organizations within Ohio provide technical assistance and professional development within specialized areas, designed to improve special education services and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence – With funding from the Department and other sources, the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence serves families, educators and professionals working with students with autism and low-incidence disabilities, including autism spectrum disorders, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairments, other health impairments and traumatic brain injuries. The statewide Center for Sensory Disabilities is housed within the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence to unify existing programs for students with deafness/hard of hearing, blind/visual impairment and print disabilities and expand them to create a collaborative comprehensive network of regional resources that positively impact the educational achievement of students with sensory disabilities. Through the center, the Office for Exceptional Children is working to build state and system-wide capacity to improve outcomes through leadership, training and professional development, technical assistance, collaboration and technology. The Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence also provides assistive technology services, including resources, professional development and loans of specific devices. More information is available at www.ocali.org.

Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities – As Ohio's Parent Training and Information Center, the Ohio Coalition for the Education of

Children with Disabilities supports parents and families of children with disabilities and works to promote support for the professionals who serve them. The Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities has both centralized and regional consultants throughout Ohio, providing parent support, resources and learning activities. More information is available at www.ocecd.org.

Parent Mentors – Across Ohio, a network of more than 100 parent mentors serve more than 16,000 parents and families of children with disabilities and those at risk. Parent mentors are parents of children with disabilities who work within school districts to provide families and school personnel with information, resources and support to build collaborative partnerships between families and schools. The details of the parent mentor role vary by location based on the needs of the district and parents. Parent mentors serve as resources for parents on a variety of topics related to special education, including the rights and services afforded to them by state and federal law, as well as networks and other resources available in their communities. They work as liaisons between families and district personnel to encourage productive communication that results in effective programs for children with disabilities.

Seminars, trainings, conferences – The Office for Exceptional Children offers various in-person and web-based seminars, trainings and conferences throughout the state targeted to school district administrators, teachers, related service providers, college/university faculty representing teacher preparation programs and parents of children with disabilities. As part of the annual OCALICON conference, the Department hosts a Special Education Leadership Institute, recently renamed the Inclusive Education Leadership Institute to reflect the Department's focus on inclusive education.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

Please see the Technical Assistance section for a description of Ohio's technical assistance and professional development system.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

71

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) initiated stakeholder engagement in target setting with the State Advisory Panel on Exceptional Children (SAPEC). ODE reviewed and discussed each of the 11 indicators with the panel and collected feedback from all members. ODE collaborated with the Statewide Family Engagement Center to meet with the Family Collaborative, including OCALI Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio. Members of the Family Collaborative were surveyed to determine the best meeting time for most participants. Following the initial meeting, the State learned that several interested parents were unable to attend and added a second meeting with the Family Collaborative to ensure maximum parent participation. ODE also met with attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE reviewed the indicator fact sheets, including trend data, data and programmatic considerations and proposed target options with each of these groups. OEC responded to all questions from participating parents and encouraged feedback in real time. Parents were directed to submit additional feedback via public comment or the designated email address.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) organized multiple opportunities to ensure diverse groups of parents were able to participate in the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) collaborates with The Ohio State University across numerous activities to support families of children with disabilities. OEC provides grant funding to the Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center to provide family and community engagement consultants to regional state support teams. This includes a community of practice to support coordination and professional development to increase collaboration, networking and communication across regions, and to improve the quality of services provided to families of students with disabilities. The focus is on high impact family engagement practices directed to families of students with disabilities, families of other vulnerable students and school districts. Partners representing agencies that directly support families of children with disabilities are included as an integral part of this community of practice, along with representatives from the Ohio Department of Education across multiple offices.

The Office for Exceptional Children provides grant funding to The Ohio State University's Center on Education and Training for Employment (CETE) along with ongoing guidance and collaboration for development, distribution and analysis of results of Ohio's annual Indicator 8 Family Survey. In addition to meeting the reporting requirements for this survey, results also provide valuable information for improving services to families of students with disabilities. The survey was redesigned to be mobile friendly, more streamlined and accessible in numerous languages (English, Spanish, Somali, Nepali, Arabic and Chinese). Results are analyzed and the team at CETE makes adjustments based on participant feedback to reach more families and provide more meaningful results. One example of an adjustment that has been made is to utilize a culture broker strategy to attempt to reach more families of differing cultural backgrounds. The numbers of families reached with this new survey format is a great increase over the previous paper version that was used.

The Office for Exceptional Children provides grant funding to the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD) for regionally-based support services to parents and families of children with disabilities. These supports may be one-on-one or trainings to groups and are available in the preferred language of the family. This year's projects funded by this grant also include continued support and development of parent-friendly documents related to a new state settlement plan (11 District Plan) and creation and provision of trainings to parents and families of children with disabilities regarding upcoming changes to the Ohio Operating Standards, the Parent's Rights handbook and revisions to the restraint and seclusion and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) state rule.

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) currently funds over 80 Parent Mentor positions throughout Ohio. Parent Mentors are parents of children with a disability who are employed by a district or educational service center to provide free support to other families of children with disabilities as they navigate the special education process. OEC guides the work of Parent Mentors and has contracted with The Ohio State University Center on Education and Training for Employment to provide ongoing oversight and professional development to all Parent Mentors. ODE continues to support and grow this program, which is unique to Ohio.

The Office for Exceptional Children has partnered with other offices within ODE to maintain the Families of Students with Disabilities webpage specifically designed to provide resources to families of students with disabilities. This page highlights existing resources for families in one central location on the state's website. The page is continuously updated with new resources and opportunities based on stakeholder feedback from numerous parent groups, including the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children and the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities. There are plans to develop additional resources for families of students with disabilities, particularly in the areas of transitions throughout a child's educational career. The Office for Exceptional Children has created a new family-friendly Evaluation Roadmap document, which has been translated into numerous languages and shared widely. This document includes links and important information about the role of the parent in this process and is available on the Families of Students with Disabilities webpage at <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Families-of-Students-with-Disabilities>.

The Office for Exceptional Children created a Family Engagement Team to connect individuals across the office who are working on family engagement projects and supports. The purpose of the team is to share updates, collaborate, and seek opportunities to support and coordinate family engagement initiatives throughout the office. This group works on alignment, awareness, sharing results from the Family Engagement survey, and maintaining the Families of Students with Disabilities resource webpage, and streamlining the resources on the ODE website to create better coherence and support easier navigation for both families and educators. Additionally, an agency-wide Family Engagement Workgroup was also created to promote a better and more consistent understanding across the agency about this work and greater opportunities to promote supports to parents.

Taken together, these efforts have increased the capacity of diverse groups of parents in Ohio to support implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As described above, ODE solicited public input via a public comment period posted to the department webpage (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). Public comment was available from September 27, 2021, through November 5, 2021. Indicator fact sheets were available for individual review prior to submitting public comment. Stakeholders had the option of commenting on as few or many indicators as they wished. Additionally, the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) recorded overviews of each fact sheet facilitated by department staff and posted the videos alongside the fact sheets. ODE held multiple stakeholder meetings during the public comment period in which target setting was reviewed and discussed. ODE directed stakeholders to submit feedback via public comment multiple times in each of these meetings. ODE facilitated a series of six virtual stakeholder meetings following the public comment period which included focused discussion of each indicator and target options. Participants drew on their individual expertise, as well as data and programmatic considerations provided by the department, to consider improvement strategies and targets that are both attainable and rigorous.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including the state advisory panel) and through regional and statewide conferences. OEC will continue utilizing these means to report annually to the public on Ohio's progress and/or slippage in meeting the indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2020 (2020-2021) APR to the department website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan>). After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the indicator targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 to the target setting website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). In order to report to the public on the performance of LEAs located in the State on the SPP/APR indicators, OEC posted a report on the department website within 120 days after submission of the APR, as required (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Resources-for-Parents-and-Teachers-of-Students-wit/District-Level-Performance-Data>). In addition to the public report, each LEA annually receives a Special Education Profile, comprised of a data profile and required monitoring activities, and an annual Special Education Rating detailing its performance on the indicators included in the subset for making LEA determinations. Special Education Profiles are available to the public (with data based on small groups of students masked as appropriate) on the department's website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Data-and-Funding/District-Level-Performance-Data>).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA 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 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, 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 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including the state advisory panel) and through regional and statewide conferences. OEC will continue utilizing these means to report annually to the public on Ohio's progress and/or slippage in meeting the indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2020 (2020-2021) APR to the department website, including any revisions to targets submitted with the FFY 2020 APR (see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan>).

In order to report to the public on the performance of LEAs located in the State on the SPP/APR indicators, OEC posted a report on the department website within 120 days after submission of the APR, as required (see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Resources-for-Parents-and-Teachers-of-Students-wit/District-Level-Performance-Data>). In addition to the public report, each LEA annually receives a Special Education Profile, comprised of a data profile and required monitoring activities, and an annual Special Education Rating detailing its performance on the indicators included in the subset for making LEA determinations. Special Education Profiles are available to the public (with data based on small groups of students masked as appropriate) on the department's website (see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Data-and-Funding/District-Level-Performance-Data>).

Ohio has reported to the public on the state's 2022 determination, required actions, and improvement strategies through the department website, including distribution through news announcements and public agency listservs (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Monitoring-System/State-Determinations>).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

See attachment "Technical Assistance Strategies Addressing Needs Assistance"

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	58.53%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	85.10%	72.30%	73.80%	75.40%	60.00%
Data	69.57%	70.45%	51.37%	47.99%	58.53%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	13,260
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	3,204
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	29
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,163

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
13,260	19,656	58.53%	62.00%	67.46%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Ohio's students in the class of 2021 had multiple pathways to earn a high school diploma:

All graduating students must complete core curriculum requirements and earn a state minimum of 20 credits in specific subjects, including 4 credits in English language arts, ½ credit in Health, 4 credits in Mathematics, ½ credit in Physical education, 3 credits in Science, 3 credits in Social studies, and 5 credits in electives. Additionally, students must receive instruction in economics and financial literacy and complete at least two semesters of fine arts. In addition to core requirements above, students must meet one of the following options to graduate:

- 1) Ohio's State Tests - Earn 18 out of 35 points on seven end-of-course state tests. Up to five points can be earned on each test. A minimum of four points in math, four points in English language arts, and six points across science and social studies is required.
- 2) Industry-recognized credential and score on workforce readiness test - Earn an industry-recognized credential or a group of credentials totaling 12 points and earn the required score on the WorkKeys test.
- 3) College and career readiness tests - Earn remediation-free scores in math and English language arts on the ACT or SAT.
- 4) Demonstrate readiness and competency – Earn 2 diploma seals, including at least 1 Ohio-designed seal, and earn a passing score on Ohio's high school Algebra 1 and English 2 tests. If students have taken the high school tests at least twice without passing, the three alternative options below become available to replace the Algebra 1 and English 2 testing requirement.
 - a. Demonstrate at least one foundational and one additional career-focused activity. Foundational activities include a proficient score on WebXams, a 12-point industry credential, or a pre-apprenticeship/ acceptance into an apprenticeship program. Supporting activities include work-based learning, a required score on WorkKeys, or an OhioMeansJobs Readiness Seal.
 - b. Provide evidence for military enlistment upon graduation.
 - c. Earn credit for one college-level math or English course through Ohio's free College Credit Plus program.

For more information on Ohio's graduation requirements, see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Ohio-s-Graduation-Requirements>

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

There are several adjustments to the state graduation requirements for a regular high school diploma that are available only to students with disabilities:

- Students with significant cognitive disabilities may take alternate assessments in lieu of end of course exams;
- A student may be exempted, based on his IEP, from the requirement to score proficient or above on end of course exams;
- A student may be exempted from the consequences of not receiving passing scores on one or more end of course exams;
- An IEP team for a student with a disability may decide, based on the student's postsecondary goals, that he will complete the required curriculum with accommodations; or
- An IEP team may decide that a student with a disability will meet curricular requirements for graduation by meeting the goals on his IEP, as permitted by Ohio Revised Code §3313.61(A)(1). This option is noted in the postsecondary transition planning section of the student's IEP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	21.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	21.70%	21.60%	21.50%	21.50%	16.68%
Data	20.26%	20.89%	20.63%	20.68%	16.68%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	13,260
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	3,204
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	29

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,163

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,163	19,656	16.68%	16.00%	16.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Local education agencies are required to report a "withdrawal reason" code each time a student changes their relationship with the LEA. The most recent withdrawal code for each student determines their exiting reason.

The withdrawal reason codes that translate to dropout status in the EdFacts exiting report (C009) are:

- Withdrew due to truancy/nonattendance
- Pursued employment/work permit: Superintendent approval on file
- Moved not known to be continuing
- Student completed course requirements: Student completed course requirements but did NOT pass the appropriate statewide assessments required for graduation. In the case of a student on an IEP who has been excused from the individual consequences of the statewide assessments, using this code indicates that the student completed course requirements but did not take the appropriate statewide assessments required for graduation.
- Non-attendance according to the 105-hour rule: A student who has had unexcused absences from a charter school for more than 105 consecutive hours must be withdrawn. If this is the most recent withdrawal reason for a student, they are counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports them as not having withdrawn, they are not included in the exiting report at the state level.
- Withdrew due to ORC §3314.26 (non-tested): Students in charter schools must participate in state testing. If they do not, they must be withdrawn. If this is the most recent withdrawal reason for a student, they are counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports them as not having withdrawn, they are not included in the exiting report at the state level.
- No longer eligible to be enrolled in district: Student eligibility changed, district does not know where education will be continued.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	85.20%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	81.88%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	83.46%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	84.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	80.92%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	81.52%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,142	20,407	22,041
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,273	5,570	6,706
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,446	12,948	12,433
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,101	1,160	1,681

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,132	20,464	19,692
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,233	5,495	5,161
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,475	13,043	11,363
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,099	1,157	1,688

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	19,820	20,142	93.29%	95.00%	98.40%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	19,678	20,407	90.25%	95.00%	96.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	20,820	22,041	91.05%	95.00%	94.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	19,807	20,132	92.89%	95.00%	98.39%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	19,695	20,464	89.86%	95.00%	96.24%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	18,212	19,692	88.60%	95.00%	92.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at: <https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview> (Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must revise its targets for FFY 2021 Reading Grades 4, 8, and HS, and Math Grades 4, 8, and HS; FFY 2022 Reading Grades 4, 8, and HS, and Math Grades 4, 8, and HS; FFY 2023 Reading Grades 4, 8, and HS, and Math Grades 4, 8, and HS; and FFY 2024 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS to align with ESEA requirements, solicit stakeholder input on the State’s targets, and report the revised targets.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Following the February 2022 submission of Ohio’s Annual Performance Report, the U.S. Department of Education required the department to revise targets for Indicator 3a: Math and Reading Assessment Participation to no lower than 95 percent per the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) section 1111(c)(4)(E) (pages 39 and 116), which was reauthorized as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Office for Exceptional Children reconvened the indicator 3 virtual stakeholder group for one hour in November 2022 to revise these targets and align with ESEA. This meeting included an introduction from Joe Petrarca, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and an overview of the need for revision from Ashley Rector, a data specialist on the Office for Exceptional Children data team. All required targets were revised to 95 percent, based on stakeholder input. The Office for Exceptional Children updated the department webpage with the revised targets and notified stakeholders through an EdConnection article in January 2023.

3A - OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for FFY 2021 Reading Grades 4, 8 and HS and Math Grades 4, 8 and HS; FFY 2022 Reading Grades 4, 8 and HS and Math Grades 4, 8 and HS; FFY 2023 Reading Grades 4, 8 and HS and Math Grades 4, 8 and HS; FFY 2024 Reading Grades 8 and HS and Math Grades 8 and HS and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	21.86%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	10.97%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	17.84%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	26.83%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	13.94%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	6.77%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	22.86%	24.86%	27.86%	31.86%	36.86%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	11.97%	13.97%	16.97%	20.97%	25.97%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	18.84%	20.84%	23.84%	27.84%	32.84%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	27.83%	29.83%	32.83%	36.83%	41.83%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	14.94%	16.94%	19.94%	23.94%	28.94%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.77%	9.77%	12.77%	16.77%	21.77%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	18,719	18,518	19,139
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,748	624	1,113
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,075	1,490	2,213

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	18,708	18,538	16,524
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,956	756	374
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,604	1,908	854

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,823	18,719	21.86%	22.86%	25.77%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,114	18,518	10.97%	11.97%	11.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3,326	19,139	17.84%	18.84%	17.38%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,560	18,708	26.83%	27.83%	29.72%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,664	18,538	13.94%	14.94%	14.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,228	16,524	6.77%	7.77%	7.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at: <https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview> (Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response**3B - Required Actions**

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	51.72%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	42.44%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	45.61%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	30.60%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	35.67%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	47.39%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	52.72%	53.72%	54.72%	55.72%	56.72%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	43.44%	44.44%	45.44%	46.44%	47.44%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	46.61%	47.61%	48.61%	49.61%	50.61%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.60%	32.60%	33.60%	34.60%	35.60%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	36.67%	37.67%	38.67%	39.67%	40.67%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	48.39%	49.39%	50.39%	51.39%	52.39%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,101	1,160	1,681
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	397	327	586

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,099	1,157	1,688
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	252	295	598

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	397	1,101	51.72%	52.72%	36.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	327	1,160	42.44%	43.44%	28.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	586	1,681	45.61%	46.61%	34.86%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the

standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	252	1,099	30.60%	31.60%	22.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	295	1,157	35.67%	36.67%	25.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	598	1,688	47.39%	48.39%	35.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Ohio has provided significant training and technical assistance to reduce the number of students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment and being measured against alternate academic achievement standards, which has resulted in almost 10,000 students with disabilities transitioning to the standard grade level assessments. The state is investing in additional professional development focused on extended standards and specialized instruction for students with the most significant disabilities to provide support for students remaining on the alternate assessment.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at: <https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview> (Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	34.24
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	41.87
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	44.65
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	33.01
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	39.28
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	31.91

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	33.24	32.24	31.24	30.24	29.24
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	40.87	39.87	38.87	37.87	36.87
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	43.65	42.65	41.65	40.65	39.65
Math	A <=	Grade 4	32.01	31.01	30.01	29.01	28.01
Math	B <=	Grade 8	38.28	37.28	36.28	35.28	34.28
Math	C <=	Grade HS	30.91	29.91	28.91	27.91	26.91

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	118,630	127,233	134,808
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	18,719	18,518	19,139
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	71,287	65,833	80,816
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,156	1,536	2,275
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,748	624	1,113
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,075	1,490	2,213

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	118,175	132,727	119,684
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	18,708	18,538	16,524
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	71,895	69,008	46,684
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,698	1,966	876
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,956	756	374
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,604	1,908	854

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	25.77%	62.75%	34.24	33.24	36.99	Did not meet target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	11.42%	52.95%	41.87	40.87	41.53	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17.38%	61.64%	44.65	43.65	44.26	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Students throughout Ohio are rebounding from the disruption to learning resulting from the ongoing disruption from COVID-19. It is likely that students with disabilities had more learning disruption due to an impact in both the areas of core instruction and in additional required supports, and they will need more time to catch up with the learning rebound that is occurring nationwide for students without disabilities.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	29.72%	63.97%	33.01	32.01	34.25	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	14.37%	53.47%	39.28	38.28	39.10	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7.43%	39.74%	31.91	30.91	32.31	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Students throughout Ohio are rebounding from the disruption to learning resulting from the ongoing disruption from COVID-19. It is likely that students with disabilities had more learning disruption due to an impact in both the areas of core instruction and in additional required supports, and they will need more time to catch up with the learning rebound that is occurring nationwide for students without disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	8.77%	8.47%	8.17%	8.17%	20.00%
Data	8.77%	5.74%	5.57%	25.00%	20.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	17.50%	15.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

928

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	4	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Data on suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities are submitted by LEAs via Ohio's Education Management Information System (EMIS) and also are used for IDEA Section 618 data/EdFacts submissions. The state collects student-level data about each discipline event, including type, reason and duration.

To calculate significant discipline discrepancies for Indicator 4a, Ohio compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with individualized education programs (IEPs) in each LEA to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

Ohio identifies an LEA as having a "significant discrepancy" in discipline rates if the rate of suspension or expulsion for more than 10 cumulative days for students with disabilities exceeds the rate of suspension or expulsion for students without disabilities by at least 1% for three consecutive years, based on a minimum cell size of 10 students with and without disabilities disciplined and a minimum n-size of 30 students with and without disabilities enrolled.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2021 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 4a, due to an adjustment in the calculation to ensure that each student receiving services at an Educational Service Center is not counted more than once.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each LEA that the state identifies as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OEC completes the following process:

A. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures and practices. Areas reviewed by the LEA include: 1) The LEA's code of conduct; 2) The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability; 3) The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes their learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address their behavior; 4) The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removals for students with disabilities; 5) The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and 6) The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

B. LEAs are required to send the completed self-review report to OEC, along with a sample of records for students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days during the applicable school year. The student records serve to verify the LEA's self-review.

C. OEC reviews the student records for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards. If any records indicate noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, OEC issues a finding of noncompliance, even if the LEA's self-review indicates full compliance.

D. OEC requires that all instances of noncompliance be corrected in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must: 1) Correct individual student records determined to be noncompliant; 2) Revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA; and 3) Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements through a review of state-selected student records from a subsequent reporting period.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OEC required each LEA with an Indicator 4a finding to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements, OEC reviewed records of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during a specific time frame in a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with discipline requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

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

For each LEA with an Indicator 4a finding, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified as missing one or more required discipline elements, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State must revise its FFY 2025 target(s) to reflect improvement over the revised baseline data.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State’s LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State’s chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4A - Required Actions

The State did not provide targets, as required by the Measurement Table. The State must provide the required targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.42%	0.53%	1.08%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

930

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Data on suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities are submitted by local education agencies (LEAs) via Ohio's Education Management Information System (EMIS) and also are used for IDEA Section 618 data/EdFacts submissions. The State collects student-level data about each discipline event, including type, reason and duration.

Significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with individualized education programs (IEPs) are determined using a risk ratio calculation. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that students with disabilities in one racial/ethnic group will be suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, compared to the likelihood that all students without disabilities in the LEA will be suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students with disabilities in a specified racial group who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the percentage of all students without disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. For example, the percent of Black students with disabilities in an LEA who are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the percent of all students without disabilities in the LEA who are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. To identify discipline discrepancies, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) uses a 2.5 risk ratio threshold. Ohio identifies an LEA as having a "significant discrepancy by race" if the risk ratio for any racial group exceeds 2.5 for three consecutive years, based on a minimum cell size of 10 students with and without disabilities disciplined and a minimum n-size of 30 students with and without disabilities enrolled.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2021 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 4b, due to an adjustment in the calculation to ensure that each student receiving services at an Educational Service Center is not counted more than once.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each LEA that the state identifies as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OEC completes the following process:

A. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures and practices. Areas reviewed by the LEA include: 1) The LEA's code of conduct; 2) The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability; 3) The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes their learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address their behavior; 4) The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removals for students with disabilities; 5) The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and 6) The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

B. LEAs are required to send the completed self-review report to OEC, along with a sample of records for students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days during the applicable school year. The student records serve to verify the LEA's self-review.

C. OEC reviews the student records for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards. If any records indicate noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, OEC issues a finding of noncompliance, even if the LEA's self-review indicates full compliance.

D. OEC requires that all instances of noncompliance be corrected in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must: 1) Correct individual student records determined to be noncompliant; 2) Revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA; and 3) Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements through a review of state-selected student records from a subsequent reporting period.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3		0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OEC required each LEA with a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 4b to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements, OEC reviewed records of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during a specific time frame in a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with discipline requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

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

For each LEA with a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 4b, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified as missing one or more required discipline elements, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021 and OSEP accepts that revision.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.00%	64.80%
A	64.80%	Data	65.81%	63.28%	63.72%	64.16%	64.80%
B	2020	Target <=	10.50%	10.20%	10.00%	10.00%	11.86%
B	11.86%	Data	12.41%	11.96%	11.89%	11.90%	11.86%
C	2020	Target <=	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	3.62%
C	3.62%	Data	3.63%	3.60%	3.77%	3.74%	3.62%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target B <=	11.80%	11.75%	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%
Target C <=	3.60%	3.56%	3.54%	3.53%	3.51%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment "Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	253,254
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	166,162

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,061
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	6,983
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	464
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	911

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	166,162	253,254	64.80%	65.00%	65.61%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,061	253,254	11.86%	11.80%	11.48%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	8,358	253,254	3.62%	3.60%	3.30%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%	66.81%
A	Data	68.28%	71.36%	73.13%	73.66%	66.81%
B	Target <=	38.40%	38.40%	38.40%	38.40%	18.94%
B	Data	21.80%	18.39%	15.94%	16.20%	18.94%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	66.81%
B	2020	18.94%
C	2020	2.98%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	67.00%	70.00%	73.00%	76.00%	80.00%
Target B <=	18.00%	16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	2.98%	2.50%	2.20%	1.80%	1.55%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	6,092	9,076	4,462	19,630
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,822	6,214	3,139	13,175
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,307	1,639	737	3,683
b2. Number of children attending separate school	106	140	96	342
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	3	1	5
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	178	149	49	376

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	13,175	19,630	66.81%	67.00%	67.12%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,030	19,630	18.94%	18.00%	20.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	376	19,630	2.98%	2.98%	1.92%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

School districts have reported an increased need for more restrictive settings for some preschool students with disabilities in order to better meet the child's social-emotional, behavioral, language and literacy needs. School districts continue to report an increasing prevalence of young children coming to preschool who were negatively impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic, the lack of opportunities to engage with same-age peers, and little to no previous experience in a structured learning setting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

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 early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** 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](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

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 (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.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2008	Target >=	80.20%	80.60%	81.00%	81.00%	81.90%
A1	64.70%	Data	83.62%	82.64%	82.46%	81.79%	80.13%

A2	2008	Target >=	50.80%	51.40%	52.00%	52.00%	50.91%
A2	47.40%	Data	50.17%	49.70%	52.69%	50.91%	49.13%
B1	2008	Target >=	80.40%	80.80%	81.20%	81.20%	80.91%
B1	65.90%	Data	82.59%	81.60%	81.90%	80.82%	79.77%
B2	2008	Target >=	50.10%	50.70%	51.30%	51.30%	48.53%
B2	45.70%	Data	48.27%	47.73%	51.40%	48.46%	47.22%
C1	2008	Target >=	82.50%	82.90%	83.30%	83.30%	83.31%
C1	66.90%	Data	85.41%	85.42%	84.78%	83.21%	81.62%
C2	2008	Target >=	61.10%	61.80%	62.50%	62.50%	59.90%
C2	59.20%	Data	60.34%	61.13%	63.05%	59.80%	57.51%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	82.20%	82.50%	82.85%	83.25%	83.70%
Target A2 >=	50.91%	50.91%	51.00%	51.20%	51.40%
Target B1 >=	81.20%	81.50%	81.85%	82.25%	82.70%
Target B2 >=	48.73%	48.93%	49.20%	49.50%	49.80%
Target C1 >=	83.60%	83.90%	84.25%	84.65%	85.10%
Target C2 >=	60.10%	60.30%	60.55%	60.85%	61.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

10,255

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	66	0.77%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,508	17.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,879	33.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,044	35.54%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,069	12.48%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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 6 years of age	5,923	7,497	80.13%	82.20%	79.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,113	8,566	49.13%	50.91%	48.02%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	82	0.96%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,577	18.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,976	34.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,059	35.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	889	10.36%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	6,035	7,694	79.77%	81.20%	78.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,948	8,583	47.22%	48.73%	46.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	71	0.83%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,312	15.36%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,364	27.68%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,418	40.03%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,374	16.09%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,782	7,165	81.62%	83.60%	80.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,792	8,539	57.51%	60.10%	56.12%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
A2	LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
B1	LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
B2	LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
C2	LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Ohio uses the Child Outcomes Summary Form and process to gather data for this indicator. To access Ohio's Child Outcomes Policy, Child Outcomes Reference Guide, Child Outcomes Summary Form, and Child Outcomes Summary Form Quality Assurance Checklist, see the Preschool Special Education Resources web page at <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Early-Learning/Preschool-Special-Education>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The 10,255 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs reflects all the students that are exiting Special Education and were assessed using the Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Form. The population for each outcome varies because some students do not have complete entry-exit pair of scores to rate and therefore are not counted in all three outcomes. A student must have two valid scores at least 6 months apart to receive a rating for a given outcome. Students are included in the overall population (10,255) if that student had a valid entry-outcome pair of scores for at least one outcome.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

In reporting the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program, the State reported 8566 as the denominator in outcome A, 8583 as the denominator in outcome B, and 8539 as the denominator in outcome C. Additionally, the State reported 10,255 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs were assessed. The State explained this discrepancy.

7 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the State must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested 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](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

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 parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, 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 parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	83.63%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%	94.00%	83.43%
Data	95.32%	90.23%	90.98%	83.63%	83.31%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5,298	7,190	83.31%	85.00%	73.69%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Respondent parents/caregivers who reported schools did not facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities were given the opportunity to select some reasons for their perspective. Analysis of this question indicates that the top reasons for their rating include:

1. Parents/caregivers find the special education process to be difficult and/or confusing.
2. Parents/caregivers do not believe that their child's IEP represents the best approach to support their child's success.
3. Parents/caregivers reported having difficulty being heard or another communication problem with school personnel.
4. Parents/caregivers do not believe school officials know enough about their child's unique needs.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

One survey was distributed to all parents in the districts surveyed, including parents of preschool-aged students. Thus, there was no need to combine data from school age and preschool surveys. The data analysis and reporting provided to districts include the combined responses from parents of preschool students and parents of school aged students.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

48,088

Percentage of respondent parents

14.95%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	16.97%	14.95%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Four strategies will be employed to attempt to increase the survey response rate. First, efforts will be undertaken to inform parents/guardians of the survey effort well in advance of administration and the value the survey process may bring in terms of improving family engagement opportunities. While this will occur mainly through informal efforts, selected communications may be developed and disseminated if warranted. Second, similar efforts will be utilized to inform school officials and other stakeholders. Third, approximately 100 Parent Mentors located throughout the state who work with families of students with disabilities on a regular basis will be utilized to promote the survey. Finally, continued use will be made of culture brokers aimed at encouraging participation among selected groups.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The presence of systematic nonresponse bias in the survey results is possible, therefore the findings may not be generalizable to all parents of children with disabilities throughout the state. However, the effect is likely minimal, as an informal review conducted by the OSU team indicate that significant improvements in the survey response rate and in number of parents/guardians who participated were achieved in the most recent survey administration. This is born out by review of the comparison of demographic characteristics of survey participants to the population of parents/guardians of children with disabilities across the state. While dramatic increases have been achieved in participation in comparison to the state's previously survey and process, the new survey process did not produce a representative sample from which to draw conclusions. Response rate will be monitored and different strategies will be explored to increase the validity of survey results if needed.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The analysis conducted by the Ohio State team revealed that as a result of the increased outreach to sub-populations of parents of students with disabilities, the representative analysis based on race/ethnicity did not include underrepresentation or overrepresentation on the basis of race/ethnicity. However, the black population has historically been the most underrepresented population, and as the sub-group with the largest non-significant difference from the population total (16.8 vs 14.7), they will continue to be targeted via outreach and culture brokers to avoid falling back into underrepresentation.

However, significant discrepancies were found in the disability type analysis. Overrepresentation was found in the Autism (14.9% of the respondents versus 10.0% in the total enrollment) and Developmental Delay (9.8% of the respondents versus 2.5% in the total enrollment) categories. Underrepresentation was found in the Specific Learning Disabilities (20.2% of the respondents versus 36.3% in the total enrollment) and Other Health Impaired (10.3% of the respondents versus 17.3% in the total enrollment) categories.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

To address historic underrepresentation, researchers will continue to implement two strategies to increase the response rate of sub-populations of parents of students with disabilities. First, the survey team will continue to assess the perspectives of the sub-populations of interest through targeted formal and informal outreach. Secondly, cultural brokers will continue to be leveraged to encourage participation of Black respondents. Culture brokers are individuals who act as a bridge or link between a school and a specific population. They are used in many disciplines to increase engagement, including healthcare and education, and have been successfully used to engage Black students and their families. In general, culture brokers share many of the identities of the communities they serve. Given their shared and personal experiences, a Black parent or educator in the role of culture broker can blend their personal experiences with culturally appropriate methods and language to inform parents of the benefits and importance of participating in the Indicator 8 survey. The greatest benefit of culture brokers is that as they engage with other parents, their actions are known to lead to increased individual advocacy with the parents they serve and later peer advocacy. Along with the invitation to parents, researchers provided a short video from a Black parent and school psychologist advocating for Black families to offer their unique perspective and complete the survey.

Additionally, we will begin to use the same tools to increased the underrepresentation from SLD.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the demographics of the survey respondents to the demographics of children receiving special education services. A difference of 3% or more in the proportion of responders compared to target group was interpreted as underrepresentation or overrepresentation.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The survey was distributed to all parents of students with IEPs within the district. These data provide evidence of the perspectives of a large group of parents of students with disabilities. The team designed a data collection effort intended to result in higher rates of participation and more representation of African American perspectives and points of view of parents/guardians of children with the full range of disability types. The team evenly distributed the 318 school districts that have a high African American student population across cohorts (i.e., at least 16.8 percent, which is the percent of African American student enrollment across the state of Ohio). Next, all other districts were randomly assigned to one of six cohorts. All LEAS will be surveyed once over each six-year cycle. The survey was distributed to all parents who meet eligibility requirements. The question reflecting the extent to which respondents believe that their child's school works with them to best meet their child's needs was scored on a 1 – 10 scale where 1 represented "not at all" and 10 represented "a great deal." For this report, scores of 7, 8, 9 or 10 were considered an indication that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Analysis performed on respondent data indicates a very high completion rate of participants, with 99% of respondents answering the final survey question used to provide results for Indicator 8.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, 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 parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The state has reported on these issues in the FFY 2021 APR.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, 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 parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.72%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.83%	0.48%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

105

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
9	6	838	0.48%	0%	0.72%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

OEC calculates disproportionate representation for the following student groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Multiracial (more than one race), and White.

- 1) Disproportionate representation of students in racial or ethnic groups is determined using risk ratios. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that students in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that students in all other racial groups will be identified. The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students from a specific racial group identified for special education divided by the percentage of students of all other races identified for special education (for example, the percent of all Asian students in an LEA who are identified with disabilities divided by the percent of all non-Asian students who are identified with disabilities).
- 2) Ohio uses 2.5 as the risk ratio threshold to identify disproportionate representation.
- 3) Ohio calculates risk ratios based on three years of data.
- 4) Ohio applies a minimum cell size of 10 for the numerator and a minimum n-size of 30 for the denominator for the calculation of risk for a specific racial subgroup and the comparison group to determine overrepresentation.

Using the criteria established above, OEC calculated risk ratios for all LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n-sizes. OEC used the review process described below to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

OEC utilizes the following process to determine if disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification:

- OEC notifies LEAs that they have disproportionate representation for students with disabilities, based on their data.
- LEAs complete self-reviews of their policies, procedures and practices relating to child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements for students with disabilities and submit the results to OEC, along with a sample of records for students in the identified racial/ethnic group.
- After evaluating the self-review reports and student records submitted by the LEAs, OEC determines the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- If inappropriate identification is discovered, each LEA must: 1. Correct individual student records determined to be noncompliant; 2. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; 3. Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements through a review of State-selected student records from a subsequent reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2021 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 9, due to an adjustment in the calculation to ensure that each student receiving services at an Educational Service Center is not counted more than once.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OEC required each LEA with an Indicator 9 finding to develop and implement an improvement plan. After all corrective actions were completed, OEC reviewed records of students with evaluations completed during a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with identification requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong

of correction). For FFY2020, OEC found 7 out of 10 districts flagged for Indicator 9 had at least one noncompliant record (70.00%).

Record Investigation - Upon notification that a district or community school was identified with disproportionality for Indicator 9, the organizations were required to submit to the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) five (5) records for the disproportionality category for which they have been flagged. The OEC Data Team has developed record review tools for each disability category based on compliance requirements and the IDEA definition of the disability category. A review team utilizes the tools to track and communicate noncompliance in the submitted records. Each tool correlates to an individual student evaluation. This tool is provided to the districts and community schools and serves as guidance for Individual Corrections.

Improvement Plan - Districts and Community Schools found to be disproportionate must complete a Self-Review Summary Report and Improvement Plan that account for factors contributing to the disproportionality and trends for noncompliance discovered during the Investigation of Records. Districts review and revise policies, practices and procedures related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements for students with disabilities. Additionally, districts are required to receive training from state support teams and establish internal monitoring teams and plan for the review of newly completed evaluations and reevaluations.

As part of Improvement Plans required of districts and community schools flagged for disproportionality in identification, districts must provide evidence of systemic improvement regarding record and indicator noncompliance. As evidence of systemic improvement, districts must also submit evaluations/reevaluations completed during a specific timeframe after the district self-review, any necessary revision to policies, practices and procedures, and relevant state supported training has occurred. These records are in addition to the original records submitted at notification and corrected during the Individual Correction period.

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

For each LEA with an Indicator 9 finding, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified with inappropriate identification, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Individual Correction - For student records found to have instances of noncompliance in the review of Indicator 9, districts and community schools are required to reevaluate the student to ensure appropriate identification of each individual student. As part of a comprehensive evaluation, districts and community schools must engage with parents/guardians to conduct planning for the reevaluation and obtain written informed consent. District and community school personnel must then conduct a reevaluation that is individualized to student need and compliant to IDEA requirements. OEC staff review each corrected evaluation as a team to ensure that all areas of noncompliance have been corrected and students have been appropriately identified. Districts and community schools must then amend IEPs to ensure that students are served and supported within the appropriate identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the four districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Though Ohio's FFY 2020 Indicator 9 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 9 in FFY 2020 because the department did not have access to FFY 2020 (2020-2021) data until FFY 2021 (2021-2022). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2021. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2022 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021.

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

9 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the 6

districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the 7 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	5.73%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.68%	0.95%	8.24%	5.92%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

105

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
79	48	838	5.92%	0%	5.73%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

OEC calculates disproportionate representation for the following student groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Multiracial (more than one race), and White.

1) Disproportionate representation of students in racial or ethnic groups is determined using risk ratios. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that students in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that students in all other racial groups will be identified. The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students from a specific racial group identified for special education divided by the percentage of students of all other races identified for special education (for example, the percent of all Asian students in an LEA who are identified with disabilities divided by the percent of all non-Asian students who are identified with disabilities).

2) Ohio uses 2.5 as the risk ratio threshold to identify disproportionate representation.

3) Ohio calculates risk ratios based on three years of data.

4) Ohio applies a minimum cell size of 10 for the numerator and a minimum n-size of 30 for the denominator for the calculation of risk for a specific racial subgroup and the comparison group to determine overrepresentation.

Using the criteria established above, OEC calculated risk ratios for all LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n-sizes. OEC used the review process described below to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

OEC utilizes the following process to determine if disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification:

- OEC notifies LEAs that they have disproportionate representation for students with disabilities, based on their data.
- LEAs complete self-reviews of their policies, procedures and practices relating to child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements for students with disabilities and submit the results to OEC, along with a sample of records for students in the identified racial/ethnic group.
- After evaluating the self-review reports and student records submitted by the LEAs, OEC determines the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- If inappropriate identification is discovered, each LEA must: 1. Correct individual student records determined to be noncompliant; 2. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; 3. Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements through a review of State-selected student records from a subsequent reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2021 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 10, due to an adjustment in the calculation to ensure that each student receiving services at an Educational Service Center is not counted more than once.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
62	62		0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OEC required each LEA with an Indicator 10 finding to develop and implement an improvement plan. After all corrective actions were completed, OEC reviewed records of students with evaluations completed during a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with identification requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction). For FFY2020, OEC found 62 out of 76 districts flagged for Indicator 10 had at least one noncompliant record (81.58%).

Record Investigation - Upon notification that a district or community school was identified with disproportionality for Indicator 10, the organizations were required to submit to the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) five (5) records for the disproportionality category for which they have been flagged. The OEC Data Team has developed record review tools for each disability category based on compliance requirements and the IDEA definition of the disability category. A review team utilizes the tools to track and communicate noncompliance in the submitted records. Each tool correlates to an individual student evaluation. This tool is provided to the districts and community schools and serves as guidance for Individual Corrections.

Improvement Plan - Districts and Community Schools found to be disproportionate must complete a Self-Review Summary Report and Improvement Plan that account for factors contributing to the disproportionality and trends for noncompliance discovered during the Investigation of Records. Districts review and revise policies, practices and procedures related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements for students with disabilities. Additionally, districts are required to receive training from state support teams and establish internal monitoring teams and plan for the review of newly completed evaluations and reevaluations.

As part of Improvement Plans required of districts and community schools flagged for disproportionality in identification, districts must provide evidence of systemic improvement regarding record and indicator noncompliance. As evidence of systemic improvement, districts must also submit evaluations/reevaluations completed during a specific timeframe after the district self-review, any necessary revision to policies, practices and procedures, and relevant state supported training has occurred. These records are in addition to the original records submitted at notification and corrected during the Individual Correction period.

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

For each LEA with an Indicator 10 finding, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified with inappropriate identification, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Individual Correction - For student records found to have instances of noncompliance in the review of Indicator 10, districts and community schools are required to reevaluate the student to ensure appropriate identification of each individual student. As part of a comprehensive evaluation, districts and community schools must engage with parents/guardians to conduct planning for the reevaluation and obtain written informed consent. District and community school personnel must then conduct a reevaluation that is individualized to student need and compliant to IDEA requirements. OEC staff review each corrected evaluation as a team to ensure that all areas of noncompliance have been corrected and students have been appropriately identified. Districts and community schools must then amend IEPs to ensure that students are served and supported within the appropriate identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 44 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Though Ohio's FFY 2020 Indicator 10 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 10 in FFY 2020 because the department did not have access to FFY 2020 (2020-2021) data until FFY 2021 (2021-2022). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2021. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2022 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021.

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the 48 districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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 the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.40%	98.79%	99.30%	98.51%	99.24%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
28,708	28,479	99.24%	100%	99.20%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

229

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

See attachment "Ind 11 - Late Table"

The Office for Exceptional Children works with each district identified with noncompliance for Indicator 11.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

Indicator 11 data are collected through the Education Management Information System (EMIS), a statewide data collection system for Ohio's primary and secondary education that provides staff, student, district/building, demographic, financial and test data. LEAs provide the dates of each step of the child find process, including the date of consent for an initial evaluation, the date of the initial evaluation, the disability category reported as an outcome of the evaluation, and any reason for noncompliance with timelines. Data for FFY 2021 represent the year-end 2021-2022 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
93	90	0	3

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE required each LEA identified with noncompliance to develop and implement an Improvement Plan. ODE reviewed Indicator 11 student-level data following the implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance. Thus, ODE determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

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

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 11 finding, ODE reviewed student-level data to verify that the LEA implemented the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Office for Exceptional Children has continued to support and monitor the districts, and will continue until the findings can be verified as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Though State's FFY 2019 Indicator 11 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) notified OSEP that it did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Consequently, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. State will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Ohio has reported on findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 in the FFY 2021 APR.

Though Ohio's FFY 2020 Indicator 11 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2020 because the department did not have access to FFY 2020 (2020-2021) data until FFY 2021 (2021-2022). Thus, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2021. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2022 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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 the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	92.02%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.99%	99.49%	91.45%	98.01%	95.78%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	5,266
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,237

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,999
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	145
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	625
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,999	3,259	95.78%	100%	92.02%	N/A	N/A

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
260

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

See Attachment Ind 12 Late Table.

The Office of Early Learning and School Readiness works with each district identified with noncompliance or incomplete data for Indicator 12 as part of the indicator review process.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

Indicator 12 data are collected through the Education Management Information System (EMIS), a statewide data collection system for Ohio's primary and secondary education that provides staff, student, district/building, demographic, financial, and test data. LEAs provide the dates of each step of the child find process, including the date of the Preschool Transition Conference for students who are eligible to be evaluated for Part B, consent for an initial evaluation, the date of the initial evaluation, the disability category found as an outcome of the evaluation, the date of the initial IEP, and any reason for noncompliance with timelines. Supplemental data containing the counts of children who were found to be eligible less than 90 days prior to their third birthday are provided by the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities, Ohio's Part C provider.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2021 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 12, due to a change in business rules to expand the date range of records considered to ensure that all records between June 1 and July 31 are included.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE required each LEA identified with noncompliance to develop and implement an Improvement Plan. ODE reviewed Indicator 12 student-level data following the implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance. Thus, ODE determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for timely transition from Part C to Part B (second prong of correction).

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

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 12 finding, ODE reviewed student-level data to verify that the LEA developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Though State's FFY 2019 Indicator 12 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) notified OSEP that it did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 12 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Consequently, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. State will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Ohio has reported on findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 in the FFY 2021 APR.

Though Ohio's FFY 2020 Indicator 12 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 12 in FFY 2020 because the department did not have access to FFY 2020 (2020-2021) data until FFY 2021 (2021-2022). Thus, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2021. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2022 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021.

12 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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 the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	99.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.96%	99.90%	99.94%	99.91%	99.95%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
53,102	53,114	99.95%	100%	99.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

Indicator 13 data are collected through the Education Management Information System (EMIS), a statewide data collection system for Ohio’s primary and secondary education that provides staff, student, district/building, demographic, financial and test data. At the student level, LEAs provide the dates of each step of the child find process, including the date of consent for an initial evaluation, the date of the evaluation, the disability category found as an outcome of the evaluation, the date of the IEP and any reason for noncompliance with timelines. Information about the secondary transition planning elements are reported as part of the IEP event record.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

Though state law now requires transition planning and services beginning at age 14, Ohio has elected to maintain consistency with Indicator 13 by continuing to report on students ages 16 and above. As part of Ohio’s system of general supervision, multiple monitoring processes are used to review transition planning requirements among LEAs beginning at age 14.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE required each LEA identified with noncompliance to develop and implement an Improvement Plan. ODE reviewed Indicator 13 student-level data following the implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance. Thus, ODE determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

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

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 13 finding, ODE reviewed student-level data to verify that the LEA implemented complete transition plans in the IEPs, unless the child was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Though State’s FFY 2019 Indicator 13 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) notified OSEP that it did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Consequently, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. State will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Ohio has reported on findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 in the FFY 2021 APR.

Though Ohio’s FFY 2020 Indicator 13 data reflected less than 100% compliance, the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2020 because the department did not have access to FFY 2020 (2020-2021) data until FFY 2021 (2021-2022). Thus, OEC did not notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2021. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2022 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, 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 collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	34.90%	35.00%	39.70%	39.70%	29.68%
A	39.60%	Data	28.81%	27.53%	27.57%	29.68%	23.65%
B	2009	Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	75.00%	79.01%
B	62.70%	Data	67.49%	70.86%	64.52%	79.01%	76.93%
C	2009	Target >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	84.00%	86.35%
C	66.60%	Data	83.44%	79.49%	84.74%	86.35%	83.14%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	39.65%
Target B >=	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
Target C >=	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,955
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,007
Response Rate	51.51%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	250
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	556
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	22
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	35

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	250	1,007	23.65%	31.00%	24.83%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	806	1,007	76.93%	80.00%	80.04%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	863	1,007	83.14%	87.00%	85.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	58.90%	51.51%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

There are several strategies that will be implemented to increase response rates. Regional technical assistance provided from the State Support Team Transition Consultants will include monitoring the number of surveys completed by a district, and encouraging and discussing with districts the importance of responses from a representative sample of exiters. During the professional development provided to district representatives for Indicator 14 data collection and reporting, the training team will encourage participants to schedule the follow-up interview at the time of the exit interview and secure additional exiter contact information. We will also recommend the use of a pre-notification strategy in which a post-card or email is sent to the exiter that reminds the individual of an upcoming interview. We will also suggest to district representatives the importance of communicating to exiters that their responses are confidential and will be aggregated with responses of other exiters from across the state. Lastly, during the professional

development for district representatives, we will stress the importance of having exiters respond to the survey item that serves as the basis for indicator 14 data analysis and reporting.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Significant results would indicate the survey respondents were different from the population of exiters targeted by the OLTS (Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study) study; therefore, non-response biases may exist and the findings of the study might not be generalizable to the population of exiters across the state during the 2020-2021 school year. As a result, caution is warranted when interpreting the findings. Using the ethnicity as an example, there was a significantly higher percentage of white (non-Hispanic) students, but significantly lower percentages of Hispanic/Latino and Black or African-American students in the survey respondents in 2020-2021. This indicates that relatively fewer students in the Hispanic/Latino and Black or African-American groups responded and provided complete data to the OLTS exit and follow-up surveys; there were relatively more white (non-Hispanic) students in the sample, compared to the state population of exiters with IEPs during the 2020-2021 school year.

To address underrepresentation of students who identify as Black or African American and Hispanic/Latino, OLTS personnel oversampled districts reporting high populations of students with IEPs across the two ethnicity categories. To increase equity and diversity in our data collection processes, OLTS personnel worked directly with district representatives to offer surveys in multiple-formats, including hard-copy, electronic, and Spanish language versions to aid district representatives in communicating with students and their family members while supporting real-time data entry for instances when district representatives were meeting with students in diverse home and community settings. Scripts were also provided to district representatives to establish rapport with students and communicate the importance of participation as an opportunity to share feedback on behalf of their diverse communities and to share how the information might be used to benefit future students in their communities.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The analysis performed by Kent State show only chance variations across gender. However, the analysis on race/ethnicity revealed an overrepresentation of students with disabilities who are white (78.4% of the OLTS sample versus 65.7% in the total exiters), and an underrepresentation of students with disabilities who are Hispanic/Latino (3.4% of the OLTS sample versus 5.6% in the total exiters), or black (12.4% of the OLTS sample versus 22.5% in the total exiters).

The analysis performed on disability category found an overrepresentation of students with specific learning disabilities (52.3% of the OLTS sample versus 46.3% in the total exiters) and an underrepresentation of students with emotional disturbance (4.5% of the OLTS sample versus 8.2% in the total exiters).

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

To address the underrepresentation of exiters who are Hispanic/Latino, black, and multiracial, and individuals with emotional disturbance, OEC and KSU will highlight strategies for securing participation from these populations during district training and information sessions. These strategies include: initiating outreach early during the reporting process; securing accurate and multiple contact information for students, parents or guardians, other close family members or friends at exit such as cell phone numbers, email, as well as physical addresses; contacting individuals through mixed-modes such as sending an email as well as mailing a letter through the US Postal Service that communicates the desire to speak with the individual about their experiences and activities and noting a specific time to expect a phone call; meeting face-to-face with individuals when possible; suggesting alternatives to cell phone use as individuals may be concerned with using cellular minutes; and engaging LEA personnel who have favorable rapport with students from these underrepresented populations for reaching out to individuals or collecting survey data. Districts that have more than 30 students with IEPs and use the roster method to survey a representative sample of their exiters will be advised to oversample exiters from underrepresented groups, including those who identify as Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American, multi-racial, or students with emotional disturbance.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the demographics of the survey respondents to the demographics of all youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. A difference of 3% or more in the proportion of responders compared to target group was interpreted as underrepresentation or overrepresentation.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

Sampling Element The targeted population (sampling element) for this indicator is the percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and within one year of leaving high school were: (1) enrolled in higher education; (2) competitively employed; (3) enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program; or (4) in some other employment.

Sampling Unit The sampling unit for this indicator consists of school districts, community schools, and State-supported schools. Each year, approximately one-sixth of these LEAs will be selected using a stratified random sampling technique. LEAs with average daily memberships (ADM) exceeding 50,000 will be required to participate in the sample each year.

Sampling Frame The common core of data resides within the Education Management Information System (EMIS) at ODE. LEA demographic data provide the sampling frame for categorizing and stratifying educational units that provide special education services to children and youth with disabilities. OEC will utilize an existing review cycle established by ODE’s Office of Federal Programs to identify LEAs for sampling across the six-year period of the State Performance Plan. The demographic data described below are reflective of LEA enrollment in Ohio during the 2005-2006 school year, when the sampling frame was developed and approved by OSEP.

Sampling Categories Ohio's 246,560 children and youth with disabilities (as of 2005-2006) receive IDEA Part B special education services through the following operationally defined categories: Category 1 Traditional Local Education Agencies – ODE recognized 611 districts as Traditional Local Education Agencies during 2005-2006. This category serviced 220,051 students with disabilities, constituting 89% of all special education students served. Category 2 Community Schools – ODE recognized 216 districts as community schools during 2005-2006. The term “community schools” is synonymous with “charter schools” in Ohio. This category serviced 7,917 students with disabilities, constituting 3% of all special education students served. Category 3 Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City Schools – OSEP requires annual sampling of all LEAs with average daily memberships (ADM) exceeding 50,000. Both the Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City Schools met this requirement in 2005-2006 but currently do not. This category serviced 18,221 students with disabilities, constituting 7% of all special education students served. Category 4 State Supported Schools – This category includes the Ohio State School for the Blind, the Ohio School for the Deaf, and the Department of Youth Services (i.e., corrections). This category serviced 371 students with disabilities, constituting <1% of all special education students served.

Sample Size The target population of the Indicator 14 survey consists of students with disabilities who are no longer in secondary school. The number of surveys required from each participating LEA is based upon its number of exiting students with disabilities. LEAs with fewer than 30 exiting students are required to survey all students; LEAs with 30 or more exiting students use a random selection process. The random selection process implements a roster method. During its review of Ohio's initial SPP, OEC conservatively estimated that exit and follow-up survey data would be collected for an average of 400-600 students each year and stratified its sampling to reflect the districts in the state. OSEP deemed this sufficient to represent the population. Personnel from Kent State University annually analyze non-response to evaluate the extent to which the sample is representative of Ohio's population of exiting students with disabilities. Regarding the representativeness of the sample group, each year the OLTS sample is analyzed and compared to the demographics of all students with disabilities exiting secondary school in Ohio.

Two surveys were designed for the OLTS—an exit survey conducted just prior to exiting secondary school and a follow-up survey conducted one year after exiting secondary school. The exit survey includes information from school records and from interviews of exiting students with disabilities. A team of State policymakers and transition advocates examined the validity and reliability of survey questions. Additionally, the surveys were revised to align with data from the second National Longitudinal Transition Study and have been reviewed at the annual conference of the National Post-School Outcomes Center. The exit surveys are numbered and divided into two sections. The first section is drawn from student records and includes 11 questions that provide background information about the student's ethnicity, disability, school setting, type of school, academic placement, career and technical education and assessment results. The second section of the exit survey is conducted via interview and includes 10 questions designed to obtain specific information about: (a) student post-school goals, (b) student perceptions of transition services received, (c) student financial plans, and (d) coursework that students needed but were unable to take. The follow-up survey is conducted via phone and includes 16 questions for the exiting student pertaining to attainment of the post-school goals recorded in the exit survey, satisfaction with post-school outcomes, retrospective evaluation of school services, post-school work, education, independent living, community participation, financial supports, satisfaction, student earnings, work hours, and reasons why postsecondary goals were not attained, if applicable. Both the exit and follow-up surveys contain no personally identifiable information. Individual identification numbers are assigned to students for the purpose of matching the exit and follow-up surveys.

Data Collection Procedures OEC selected LEAs for participation in the sample and contacted the LEAs. The LEAs received an explanation of Indicator 14 in relation to the requirements of IDEA 2004 and directions for obtaining survey packets from Kent State University. OEC and Kent State University conducted informational meetings with Ohio's SSTs, beginning in the fall of 2006. The SSTs scheduled meetings with the LEAs selected in each region, in order to provide training and technical assistance for conducting the exit and follow-up surveys. This training cycle is repeated annually for each subsequent cohort of selected LEAs. Survey information is collected by LEA personnel that have access to student records. Surveys are conducted by interview with the student as the respondent, whenever possible. The exit survey requests students to provide multiple forms of contact, in order to improve follow-up phone interview response rates. LEAs with follow-up phone interview response rates below 60% are encouraged to employ alternate means (such as web searches) to locate students who have exited. LEA personnel maintain the first page of the survey with identifiable student information and the survey number. After completion, numbered surveys with no identifiable student information are forwarded to Kent State University for coding and data analyses. Kent State personnel follow a protocol for analysis approved by the university's Institutional Review Board.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, 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 response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The state has reported on these issues in the FFY 2021 APR.

14 - OSEP Response

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, 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 response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B 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 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on 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 data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	20
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment "Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	50.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	40.00%-48.00%	41.00% - 49.00%	42.00% - 50.00%	42.00%-51.00%	8.00%
Data	41.07%	54.17%	36.07%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	16.00%	24.00%	32.00%	40.00%	48.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	20	0.00%	16.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling 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 resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on 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 data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	118
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	25
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	66

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.00%-83.00%	76.00% - 84.00%	77.00% - 85.00%	77.00%-85.00%	77.00%-85.00%
Data	76.32%	79.56%	81.76%	80.00%	77.24%

Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	77.00%	85.00%	78.00%	86.00%	79.00%	87.00%	80.00%	88.00%	84.00%	88.00%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
25	66	118	77.24%	77.00%	85.00%	77.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The federal fiscal years 2020-2025 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will expand upon the foundation established in the previous SSIP, The Early Literacy Pilot, by pivoting and expanding into high school to ensure students with disabilities are making progress toward graduation and successful post-school outcomes. Based upon this pivot to high school, the state-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) will focus on Indicator 1: the percentage of youth with individualized education programs exiting high school with a regular high school diploma. Specifically, Ohio will increase the percentage of students with a disability graduating with a regular high school diploma to 70% by the 2025-2026 school year.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The need to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities is common theme identified across several stakeholder-driven efforts initiated by the Office for Exceptional Children, including Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's strategic plan to improve learning experiences and outcomes for students with disabilities and the 11 District Plan: designed to improve the rate of achievement for the 11 Districts in areas specifically identified for improvement in the Special Education Profiles published by the Department: graduation rates (Indicator 1) and postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities (Indicator 14) among other areas.

Planning for the State Systemic Improvement Plan leveraged the results of systems analysis conducted by the Department with input from various stakeholder groups and state committees. These efforts are foundational to Department's decision to pivot from the previous SSIP focus on Early Literacy to improving graduation rates for students with disabilities.

The results of Department led data analysis and discussions with stakeholders identified six systems areas, highlighted below, which are described fully in Each Child Means Each Child and the 11 District Plan. These areas are also addressed in the State Systemic Improvement Plan Each Child On Track.

Each Child Means Each Child

- Inclusive and Shared Leadership. Leadership is one of the keys to ensuring an inclusive learning environment. The formation of collaborative cross-discipline teams at the district, building and teacher levels plays an essential part in shared leadership structures. In addition, forming professional learning communities centered around inclusive practices will assist educators in fostering high expectations for students who have been identified as needing special education services.
- Professional development for general education staff and administrators. General educators often do not receive preservice training or ongoing professional learning in teaching students with disabilities.
- Preparation for postsecondary settings. Ohio's challenges to prepare students with disabilities for successful postsecondary outcomes are compounded by the number of students with disabilities who do not achieve high school completion each year. Exempting students with disabilities from certain graduation requirements perpetuates the cycle of low expectations. It does not prepare those students who could prove successful in two- or four-year colleges, universities, the workforce, or military service.
- Continuous Improvement Processes. Many Ohio districts struggle to use and understand the data they collect regarding their students, especially students with disabilities. Schools and districts implementing a continuous improvement process can show amazing progress in improving educational outcomes for students. The Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) is an example of a continuous improvement process and can be used as an organizational strategy for districts by providing structure and focus for district teams to follow, resulting in intentional actions.

The 11 District Plan

- Professional Learning for Leadership and Teachers. Provide professional learning for leadership and teachers focused on areas of greatest need, emphasizing student achievement, including the Least Restrictive Environment.
- Postsecondary Transition. Increase the focus on strategies for improving postsecondary transition. Focus on educating and empowering statewide and regional partners to provide quality training and implementation of transition throughout the state.

In addition, to the systems areas identified above, the Office for Exceptional Children reviewed current policies and state initiatives implemented among Department offices to identify multiple efforts which might be leveraged in support of the State Systemic Improvement Plan's focus on improving graduation rates for students with disabilities. Leveraging these efforts was determined to be critical to the success of Each Child On Track with staff represented on the State Systemic Improvement Plan design and implementation team (SSIP design and implementation team) and leadership team (SSIP leadership team).

- Ohio graduation policy, Career Advising Policy and business advisory council policy - implemented in the Center for Performance and Impact, Office of Graduate Success
- Excessive Absenteeism policy and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports - implemented in the Center for Student Supports-Office of Whole Child Supports
- Secondary transition enhancement funds – State General Revenue Funds allocated specifically to enhance transition service delivery in Ohio

Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant –to develop an Early Warning Systems Tool (EWS Tool) and progress toward graduation reporting tool within the Ohio District Data Exchange (ODDEX) that is available at no charge to all districts in Ohio - a federal grant awarded to the Department in Spring 2020.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

The data source used to support the change of the SiMR was Ohio's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Indicator 1 and Indicator 2 data for the 2018-2019 school year. Additional data sources include Each Child Means Each Child and the 11 District Plan.

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Data from the last three years place Ohio within the lowest-performing group of states on graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities. Ohio's percentage of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular high school diploma in 2018-2019 was the second lowest in the nation at 48%, excluding U.S. territories with small student populations and Ohio received a 2021 Special Education Determination score of Needs Assistance for the second year in a row. This determination was due to earning zero points for the graduation rate (Indicator 1) and the dropout rate (Indicator 2) for students with disabilities. Given this determination, the Department prioritized increasing the percentage of students with a disability graduating with a regular diploma. The percentage of students with disabilities that graduated with a regular diploma was 58.53% in 2019-2020. Ohio was one of 38 states and territories to receive a 2022 Special Education Determination score of Needs Assistance which was now the third year in a row. The determination was a result of high rates of students with disabilities graduating by modified requirements and dropping out of high school. The specifics of this determination elevated the urgency to address graduation and dropout rates and sparked the Department's decision to focus on Indicator 1 for the SiMR. It is important to note that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, an emergency Ohio law was enacted that gave eligible students in the classes of 2020 and 2021 graduation flexibility which resulted in more students in Ohio overall earning a diploma and more students with disabilities graduating by the same requirements available to typical peers. Thus, more students with disabilities could be counted as graduating with a regular diploma for Indicator 1 in 2019-2020. This graduation flexibility is no longer an option and therefore a focus on Indicator 1 remains a priority.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

The Department has long valued the involvement of external stakeholders in providing input to the design and implementation of policies, procedures and state-level initiatives. During the development of Ohio's initial State Systemic Improvement Plan, various stakeholder groups provided input to the process. The SSIP stakeholder team was directly involved in developing the systemic plan using a collaborative decision-making process, structured dialogue and inquiry. This process led to the identification of the initial strategic focus on Early Literacy outcomes which may contribute to fewer students requiring special education and related services. The initial plan was embedded in a broader theory of change with pathways to long-term outcomes related to college and career readiness. Department staff and many stakeholders had expectations that progress on other APR indicators would be evident. In the long term, enhanced early literacy had the potential to reduce discipline incidences (Indicator 4), increase graduation rates (Indicator 1) and decrease dropout rates (Indicator 2).

The decision made by the Department to change the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) was reported in the FFY 2020-2021 Annual Performance Report (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan> page 91), as summarized below. The Department engaged stakeholders in a target-setting process. The Department shared the state's performance on Indicator 1 graduation rate from the last two years. These data illustrate that Ohio is among the lowest-performing states on graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities. Ohio's percentage of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular high school diploma in 2018-2019 was the second lowest in the nation at 48%, excluding U.S. territories. In addition, stakeholders reviewed Data Fact Sheets which provided detailed information in several areas, such as how well Ohio has performed over time and compared to other states; data considerations, including how the data has changed; programmatic considerations, such as evidence-based strategies and initiatives that may improve district policies, procedures and practices. Stakeholders used this information to select proposed targets that are rigorous yet attainable.

After reviewing state data which led to recommending more rigorous targets for Indicator 1, including Ohio's determination status of "needs assistance," stakeholders thoroughly understood the urgency to address improving graduation rates for students with disabilities. Three stakeholder groups that provided input to the Department's proposal to change the focus of indicator 17 to increasing the percentage of students with a disability graduating with a regular diploma and developing the related SiMR were the Guiding Coalition, state support team (SST) directors and the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children.

These groups are involved in long-term efforts which support indicator 1, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, the 11 District Plan and Future Forward Ohio priorities such as preparing students for future success, specifically, helping students rediscover their "why" for learning and more smoothly transition to their next stages through career and college connections.

Discussions on Ohio's Theory of Action and SiMR statement were incorporated into regular meetings between the Department and these groups. For example, the State Advisory Panel engaged in small group discussions about Ohio's Theory of Action and SiMR. Participants shared their perceptions of these documents and provided individual written feedback on guiding questions about documents. Recommendations from the stakeholder groups lead to revisions to Ohio's Theory of Action and SiMR. Stakeholders also suggested strategies to communicate the SiMR to the field clearly.

The Department changed the SiMR for FFY 2020-2025 to focus on Indicator 1: the percentage of youth with individualized education programs exiting high school with a regular high school diploma. As a result, Ohio will see the following increase in graduation rates in selected districts:

- A higher percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma as measured by Indicator 1 of the annual performance report.
- A higher percentage of all students in grades 9 through 12 are on track for meeting regular graduation requirements, as measured by the early warning system and progress toward meeting graduation requirement reports.

The Guiding Coalition advises the Department on implementing Each Child Means Each Child, Ohio's strategic plan to ensure that students with disabilities benefit from the Ohio's strategic plan for education. The Coalition serves as a champion for the work, shares the Department's efforts with their constituents and brings feedback from the field as the work progresses. This vital communication feedback loop enables the Department to identify challenges and anticipate potential roadblocks faced by educators in the field for SSIP. The Guiding Coalition reviewed the data for Ohio's performance on Indicator 1, the proposed new targets and agreed with the more rigorous targets. The Coalition agreed that Indicator 1 should be the state-identified measurable result for the state systemic improvement plan. Going forward, the Guiding Coalition will ensure that the successful practices achieved by districts implementing the SSIP Each Child On Track may be embedded in the efforts to improve the performance of high school students involved with implementing Each Child Means Each Child.

Ohio's 16 regional state support teams (SSTs) support Each Child On Track as stakeholders who inform the process and regional implementers who work with districts participating in Each Child On Track. SST directors are represented on the SSIP leadership team and the Guiding Coalition. SSTs assist districts and schools with improving student outcomes, focusing on leadership, collaborative team structures, continuous improvement efforts and inclusive instructional practices. For the SSIP, state support teams are integral to Ohio's infrastructure. They play a critical role in supporting participating districts and provide feedback to the Department on the effectiveness of implementation. SST directors have a direct role in sustaining the state's efforts to improve graduation by supervising the regional implementation teams working with participating districts. In years 2-5, SST staff will have a collaborative role leading a regional community of practice for participating districts enabling districts to build collaborative relationships with families of students with disabilities.

The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) is an advisory group defined in IDEA whose purpose is to provide broad-based input to the Department regarding policies, practices and issues related to the education of students and youth with disabilities who are between the ages of birth through 21. The State Advisory Panel is comprised of forty-three members of which twenty-three are individuals with disabilities or parents of students

with disabilities. The state advisory panel receives periodic updates on progress toward implementing the State Systemic Improvement Plan implementation and evaluation. For Each Child On Track, the panel participated in a facilitated discussion related to selection of rigorous targets for Indicator 1 and the state systemic improvement plan. The panel also discussed and provided input on the intent of the state-identified measurable result. As the project progresses, the panel will review and provide feedback on the effective use of evidence-based practices implemented by the SSTs and participating districts, provide feedback on evaluation outcomes, recommend project improvements and advise the Department on effective strategies which promote family engagement.

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The SSIP design and implementation team considered two main factors when identifying districts that would make good candidates for participation. These were 1) Indicator 1 rate below 60% based on 2018-2019 graduation data and 2) district differentiated accountability scores that require use of the OIP and work with the SST. The team also considered the district special education determination and the percentage of students with disabilities as compared to the state. Final district selections included districts with a positive working relationship with the SST and were deemed to be good candidates for the project.

The project focuses on grades 9-12 and includes students with and without disabilities. Whenever possible and appropriate the project will also include students who do not attend the high school building, but the district is their district of residence, such as students who attend a career-technical education center.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan Each Child On Track will consist of five cohorts, with staggered starts throughout the five-year project. Cohort 1 began in Spring 2022 consists of six districts supported by six of Ohio's 16 regional state support teams. District recruitment for Cohort 2 is currently underway. The remaining ten SSTs are expected to recruit ten new districts to make up Cohort 2. The six SSTs which began during Cohort 1 are expected to recruit six new districts during the spring 2023 as Cohort 3. Cohort 2 SSTs will work with 10 new districts as Cohort 4 which will start in fall 2024. Cohort 5 will be open to any district that would like to partner with an SST or educational service center and start in winter 2025.

Each district in cohort 1 has only one high school building participating in the project. As of the October FY22 headcount, the total number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 in the participating high schools of Cohort 1 districts is 4,084, and the total number of students with disabilities is 775. This number does not include students with disabilities who are enrolled in the high school and beyond grade 12 as these students represent a small number masked as < 10 during reporting. Based on these data, the percentage of grade 9-12 students with disabilities currently enrolled in Cohort 1 districts is 19%. The percentage of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 for the 2021-2022 school year in Ohio is 14.76%.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The strands of action within the theory of action from the previous Early Literacy Pilot have been updated to include activities and outcomes that address the new SiMR. These new activities and outcomes target high school-level students with disabilities, families, school personnel and other agency partners. The strands of action with updated activities are as follows: Family Partnerships: Facilitating school personnel to prepare, involve and empower families of secondary transition-age youth with disabilities to engage in the secondary transition planning process and make informed decisions that support their children's successful post-school outcomes. School Personnel Capacity: Building the capacity of school personnel to implement Ohio's graduation plan, career advising, business advisory council and excessive absenteeism policies, positive behavioral interventions and supports legislation, as well as evidence-based predictors (family engagement, interagency collaboration, career development) and practices (early warning intervention and monitoring system, adolescent literacy and mathematics) for students with disabilities so that each child will have equitable access to the program structures. Collaborative Structures: Coordinating partnerships with regional SSTs, educational service centers, institutions of higher education, Ohio's Statewide Family Engagement Center, adult agency providers and workforce partners. Multi-tiered Systems of Support: Creating an early-warning tool, progress toward meeting graduation requirement reports and an intervention inventory that includes attendance, academic and behavior at the universal, targeted and intensive levels so that students are accurately identified and supported. Leadership: Promoting the use of the state performance plan, early warning and progress monitoring data within the Ohio Improvement Process to provide students with disabilities equitable access to the services and supports needed to meet their individual needs in the least restrictive environment and ensure students with disabilities are on track to graduate. As a result of this action, Ohio will see a higher percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma as measured by Indicator 1 and then, ultimately, more students with disabilities engaged in post-school competitive integrated employment, education or a meaningful, self-sustaining vocation.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Ohio's Theory of Action for Each Child On Track can be found at the following link:
<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes/Ohio-SSIP-Theory-of-Action-Dec-2022.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	58.53%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
135	196		62.00%	68.88%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source being used for the FFY 2021 data is Indicator 1. Indicator 1 is calculated using the EdFacts FS009 data source. This indicator measures the percentage of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting high school with a regular high school diploma.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The EdFacts FS009 (Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education) data source and the data from the Education Management Information System (EMIS) are used to calculate Indicator 1. Take the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. Divide that number by the number of all youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who left high school. The result is the percentage of youth exiting high school with a regular high school diploma.

The following categories of youth with IEPs who exited special education are included in the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school: (a) Graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) Graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) Received a certificate; (d) Reached maximum age; or (e) Dropped out.

The FFY 2021 SPP/APR data derives from Indicator 1 data aggregated for the six districts in grades 9-12 in Cohort 1 of the project.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Early Warning Data: Participating districts will use an EWS Tool that includes established thresholds for identifying students who are at risk in the areas of attendance, course performance and behavior. Based on these thresholds, districts will submit the number of students with and without disabilities in grades 9 – 12 who are identified as at risk each quarter. The Department will analyze this data to identify trends in the number of students identified as at risk in each category in participating districts.

Progress Toward Graduation Reports: In addition to the early-warning system tool, districts will use Department-developed Progress Toward Graduation Reports that highlight the graduation requirements that students have met and still need to meet. The reports will also indicate which students are using graduation requirement options determined by Individualized Education Program Team decisions and as a result are not on track to earn a regular diploma.

These data (i.e., Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 student data), are not available for cohort 1 districts until winter (January 2023). Results will be analyzed and reported in the next SSIP report.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

A link to Ohio's current evaluation plan can be found on the Department's website using this address:

<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes/Each-Child-On-Track-Evaluation-Plan.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

As a result of the newly identified SiMR, a new evaluation plan has been developed. The Department has contracted with the American Institutes for Research to conduct an external evaluation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan Each Child On Track. The external evaluation of SSIP is intended to provide timely feedback to the SSIP design and implementation to inform the continuous improvement of the initiative.

In collaboration with the external evaluator, the Department has developed a logic model that describes the relationships among the SSIP inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes and provides the foundation for the evaluation plan. Logic model outcomes are divided into short, medium, and long-

term outcomes and include improved knowledge and capacity of state, regional and district personnel, improved implementation of evidence-based practices for secondary students with disabilities, and improved outcomes for students with disabilities. For example, by the Department providing professional learning for SSTs, district leadership teams (DLTs), building leadership teams and teacher-based teams on evidence-based predictors of post-school success for students with disabilities, these teams will increase their knowledge of the practices, which in turn will improve implementation of these policies and practices within the OIP and then establish sustainable systems for implementing these policies and practices. The evaluator will collect data at the state, region and district level to help the Department understand implementation successes and barriers and outcomes associated with the initiative. Key measures include the Each Child On Track Expectations and Implementation Rubric, the Ohio Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (EWIMS) fidelity rubric, and SST and district capacity surveys and interviews.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

As referenced in Section A of this report, data from the last three years place Ohio within the lowest-performing group of states on graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities. Given this performance, the Department, with stakeholder support, prioritized increasing the percentage of students with a disability graduating with a regular diploma and pivoted the State Systemic Improvement Plan in this direction. The changes and updates to the project evaluation plan described in Q-24 were therefore necessary to effectively address this new focus.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Governance

- Project Team Structure (SSIP design and implementation team, State Support Team Implementation Teams (SST team), DLTs): The project team structure at the state, regional and local levels have been carefully developed to ensure systems integration and opportunities for support and collaboration. First, the content areas and roles represented on the SSIP design and implementation team mirror those on the regional state support team implementation team and DLTs. For example, there is a data lead on the SSIP design and implementation team, SST implementation team and SLT. Data leads from the Department, state support teams and districts can provide data support to their own teams as well as reach out to the Department, regional and other district data leads for support throughout the project. Second, the SSIP design and implementation team, SST implementation teams and DLTs include individuals with a wide range of content knowledge to ensure the needs of each student can be addressed within the project. All too often content area work becomes siloed which not only prevents comprehensive support delivery but leads to duplicative efforts. It is anticipated that the project team structures produce more efficient and effective service delivery.

Data and Quality Standards

- Early Warning Systems Tool: The Department is in the process of developing an EWS Tool within the ODDEX system. This tool will be free for all districts in Ohio. Districts participating in the project will use the Tool to identify students, including those with disabilities, in grades 9-12 who are at risk for not graduating with a regular diploma based on the following indicators and thresholds (quality standards): 1) attendance –10% or more absences within a grading period.; 2) course performance – failing any credit-bearing course; and 3) behavior – any suspension or expulsion within a grading period. In addition, the Department has developed Progress Towards Graduation Reports within ODDEX that will allow the district to track the progress of students towards meeting regular graduation requirements.

- Ohio Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System Implementation Guide: EWIMS is an evidence-based practice for identifying and monitoring students who are at risk of dropping out of school. EWIMS will be integrated into the OIP an organizational strategy (quality standards) supported by the Department, within this project and will support efforts to systematically identify students who show signs of struggling in school, match these students with appropriate interventions, and monitor students' progress in these interventions. The Department finalized the Ohio EWIMS Implementation Guide which builds the capacity of district and building teams to implement EWIMS.

- Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric: The SSIP design and implementation identified a set of universal policies and practices (quality standards) that districts will implement during the project to establish a foundation to keep students on-track for graduating with a regular high school diploma and on the path to postsecondary success. These policies and practices are based on effective practices correlated to postsecondary education, employment and independent living for students with disabilities. For example, an expected practice in the area of mathematics supports is for districts to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice (<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/Mathematics/Model-Curricula-in-Mathematics/Standards-for-Mathematical-Practice/Standards-for-Mathematical-Practice.pdf.aspx>). Additionally, several of the universal policies and practices are current federal and state requirements, so the project will help districts meet compliance and implement project activities with fidelity. The SST implementation teams will use the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric to monitor district implementation at each grading period. The SSIP design and implementation team will support the SSTs as they coach the districts toward meeting the criteria outlined in the rubric. This information can be used within Ohio's continuous improvement process to determine the level and areas of needed support. The "in-progress" category indicates that the team implementation matches the project expectations while "quality" provides an aspirational goal for teams to move toward.

Professional Development

- State Support Teams: The Department conducted a series of five professional development sessions for participating SSTs in August, September and October 2022. Sessions provided guidance to participating SST members on the timeline and components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, roles and expectations of participants and key content area information such as integrating the OIP and EWIMS, early warning indicators of attendance, course performance and behavior, multi-tiered systems of support and graduation requirements. Additional session topics included evidence-based predictors of post-school success for students with disabilities, serving students with disabilities in career-technical pathways and introduction of the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric and Ohio EWIMS Implementation Guide.

- District Leadership Teams: The Department has established partnership agreements with six districts to participate in Cohort 1 of Each Child On Track. SSTs began supporting districts with Each Child On Track content in fall 2022. SSTs assist districts in establishing a leadership team responsible for reviewing early-warning data, assigning students to interventions aligned with their individual needs and monitoring students' progress in interventions. In addition, DLTs will improve district infrastructure and universal policies that promote success for secondary school students with disabilities.

Fiscal

The Department has developed a Memorandum of Understanding between the Cohort 1 districts. The Memorandum of Understanding delineates the roles, responsibilities and expectations for the project as well as the tools that will be used in data collection and elements for which districts will receive funding. Funding in the first year of the project will be available for stipends for district "champions" to develop the organizational structures needed to complete project activities, substitute reimbursement as applicable for team member attendance at meetings, mileage reimbursement for travel to a regional meeting and stipend for the district data contact to manage data within the Ohio EWS Tool. Specific deliverables for the project are also outlined in the Performance Agreement that the Department maintains with the SSTs. Both documents will be reviewed and updated at the end of each fiscal year.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

As this a new SIMR/SSIP, many activities have just started and outcomes have not yet been measured. A summary of initial progress is provided below.

Governance

Project Team Structure (SSIP design and implementation team, SST implementation teams, DLTs): The SSIP design and implementation team consists of Department personnel from across departments including the Office for Exceptional Children, Office of Graduate Success, the Office of Learning and Instructional Strategies and the Office of Whole Child Supports, among others, and includes representation from regional support personnel. The SSIP design and implementation team met twice per month during the reporting period to plan and lead the SSIP. Outputs of the team's work include professional learning materials, implementation guidance and timelines for participating SST and district personnel. The content areas represented on the SST implementation teams and DLTs have become increasingly comprehensive, with continued efforts to mirror those represented on the SSIP design and implementation team. Most notable during this reporting period has been the development of the data team member role at the Department, State Support Team and district levels. Data representatives from the Department have met twice with SST and district data contacts to review district quarter one and quarter two early warning data. The SST implementation team data contacts recommended that the Department form a community of practice for data contacts. The community of practice will be facilitated by the SSIP design and implementation team data contacts beginning in February 2023.

Data and Quality Standards

- Ohio Early Warning Systems Tool: The Department continues to develop the Ohio EWS Tool within the ODDEX system and anticipates the Tool will be ready use in late spring 2023. In the meantime, while not as efficient as the Tool, participating districts are pulling student-level data based on the early warning indicators and thresholds from the district student information systems. State Support Team data contacts are building capacity of the district data contacts to pull these data and organize into reports that can be easily understood by the DLT.
- Ohio Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System Implementation Guide: State Support Team Implementation Teams are currently coaching District Leadership Teams to review and analyze the early warning data that has been collected from the student information systems. The steps allow the DLT to identify students who are at-risk for not graduating and determine root causes for why the students are at-risk. Once the reasons for risk have been determined, the district, building and teacher-based teams can match students to interventions and begin to implement these interventions within a multi-tiered system of support.
- Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric: The SSIP design and implementation team will assist the SST Implementation Teams as they coach the districts toward meeting the criteria outlined in the rubric. This data will be used to determine implementation fidelity as well as areas of support needed to develop the foundational structures that keep students on-track for graduation. These foundational structures, once in place, will support development of sustainable practices which promote systems change districtwide.

Professional Development

- State Support Teams: The Department facilitated five professional development sessions for SSTs in fall 2022. Following each professional development session, participants rated the overall quality of the training. Out of 63 respondents across post-event surveys, 54 (86%) indicated that the overall quality of trainings was Very Good or Excellent. In addition, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they felt that the training prepared them to support districts' understanding of implementing the components of Each Child On Track. Out of 63 responses, the average rating was 3.6 on a 5-point scale where 1 = to no extent, 2 = to some extent, 3 = to a moderate extent, and 4 = to a considerable extent, and 5 = to a great extent. Building capacity of the SSTs is necessary to establish an effective cascade of support from the state to the local level that leads to sustainable implementation. Improvements in SST capacity relate to the professional development area of a systems framework and align to the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. (https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Professional-Development/Organizing-for-High-Quality-Professional-Development/Finalstandards-professional-development_FINAL.pdf.aspx)
- District Leadership Teams: SSTs began supporting Cohort 1 DLTs with Each Child On Track content in November and December 2022. Initial meetings focused on introducing the initiative, including overviewing the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. SSTs also provided information on collecting and analyzing early-warning indicator data in the areas of attendance, behavior, reading, and math. DLTs will integrate the EWIMS process within the existing OIP and use early-warning indicators to identify students who are not on track for graduation, provide interventions and monitor students' progress. These outcomes relate to the professional development area of a systems framework and align to the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. (https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Professional-Development/Organizing-for-High-Quality-Professional-Development/Finalstandards-professional-development_FINAL.pdf.aspx)

Fiscal

Each of the six districts has submitted the Memorandum of Understanding with a signature from the superintendent. The SST directors and Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction have also signed the document. Funds have been transferred to the districts for use as described in Q-26 of this report.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Governance

Project Team Structure (SSIP design and implementation team, SST implementation teams, DLTs): It is anticipated that the DLTs will represent a diverse set of knowledge and skills that mirror the SSIP design and implementation team and SST implementation team. Teams will include an Administrator who can assist with systems integration in the high school, career technical center, and grades 9-12. Along with team members who possess the knowledge, skills or abilities outlined in the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. The Department also plans to partner with regional educational service centers with SST implementation teams to build capacity for scaling the work statewide. The SSIP design and implementation team will develop a project webpage that will serve as an on-demand resource for SST implementation and districts as well.

Data and Quality Standards

- Ohio Early Warning Systems Tool: It is anticipated that Cohort 1 districts will be using the Ohio EWS Tool to efficiently print reports of students who are at-risk of not graduating rather than cobbling together reports from various areas within the district student information system. The external evaluator will collect the number of students with and without disabilities in grades 9-12 who have been identified as at-risk in each of the early warning indicator categories on a quarterly basis. An analysis of these data will be included in the next Indicator 17 report.
- Ohio EWIMS Implementation Guide: Cohort 1 districts will have completed the seven-step EWIMS process with the DLTs during the next reporting

period. This includes providing and progress monitoring interventions. An EWIMS rubric will be used to report implementation fidelity and outcomes in the next reporting period.

- Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric: The SST implementation teams will have supported each Cohort 1 DLT to determine progress toward completing each of the activities within the rubric. It is anticipated that each district will be operating within the “in-progress” category.

Professional Development

- State Support Teams: The SSIP design and implementation team will meet quarterly with the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 SST implementation teams to discuss district early warning data, the EWIMS process and progress within the Each Child on Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. Evaluation results from these quarterly meetings will be included in the next report. It is anticipated that the Cohort 1 SST implementation teams will demonstrate an increased knowledge in areas such as project timelines, the EWIMS process and criteria for activities within the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. It is also anticipated that the team members will report an increasing capacity to coach DLTs within the project. As stated in Q 29, the Cohort 1 SST data contacts requested a community of practice. The Design and Implementation Team data contacts will facilitate this group and expect participants to gain knowledge in early warning data use and coaching as well as develop a standard approach to coaching district data use throughout the project.
- District Leadership Teams: The Cohort 1 SST implementation teams will meet at least quarterly with the Cohort 1 DLTs to discuss district early warning data, the EWIMS process and progress within the Each Child on Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. It is anticipated that the team members will report an increasing capacity to independently implement EWIMS and rubric activities. The Cohort 2 SST implementation team will also provide professional development to build capacity of new Cohort 2 DLTs. It is expected that the team members will develop an understanding of project timelines, the EWIMS process and criteria for activities within the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. The Department and Design Team will facilitate a quarterly community of practice for Cohort 1 SST implementation teams and district leadership beginning in December 2024. This community of practice will allow peer-to-peer networking and problem solving which will ultimately lead to self-sustaining project implementation.

Fiscal

A Memorandum of Understanding will be signed by the Department and the Cohort 1 districts and State Support Teams each fiscal year to ensure all parties are aware of the expectations for the given year. Funds will also be distributed and allocated based on the district's Cohort and year of participation. Cohort 1 districts will use data that has been collected from review and analysis of early warning data and the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric during FY 23 to select universal supports and targeted and intensive interventions to implement at the district or high school building levels. The Department will provide funds to cover costs of professional development and materials needed for effective implementation. Cohort 1 districts will also receive funds for stipends/substitutes to participate in the Establishing Families as Partners in the Secondary Transition Planning Process learning experience and community of practice. The district will continue to receive funds for the district data contact to manage data within the Ohio EWS Tool Cohort 2 districts will receive stipends for district “champions” to develop the organizational structures needed to complete project activities, substitute reimbursement as applicable for team member attendance at meetings, mileage reimbursement for travel to a regional meeting and stipend for the district data contact to manage data within the Ohio EWS Tool.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Implementation of the evidence-based strategies below will have just started at the time this report is submitted.

The SSIP design and implementation team has provided professional development to the Cohort 1 SSTs which have in turn provided professional development to DLTs in the following areas:

- Early Warning Systems Tool with research-based indicators and thresholds (Allensworth and Easton, 2007; Balfanz, 2009; Rumberger, et al., 2017)
- Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (Faria, et al., 2017) integrated within the Ohio Improvement Process
- Predictors of Postschool Success for Students with Disabilities (Mazzotti, et al., 2020); (NACT: C, 2021)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Early Warning Systems Tool with research-based indicators and thresholds

The Department is developing an EWS Tool within the ODDEX system. This Tool is free for districts in Ohio. Districts in the project will use the Tool to identify students, including those with disabilities, in grades 9-12 who are at-risk for not graduating with a regular diploma based on the following indicators and thresholds: 1) attendance –10% or more absences within a grading period.; 2) course performance – failing any credit-bearing course; and 3) behavior – any suspension or expulsion within a grading period. In addition, districts will use Progress Towards Graduation Reports from ODDEX to determine students who are at-risk for not meeting regular graduation requirements.

Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System integrated within the Ohio Improvement Process

District Leadership Teams will use the data from the Ohio EWS Tool and Progress Toward Graduation Reports to identify students at risk for not meeting regular graduation requirements. DLTs will follow the seven steps of the EWIMS process to review and analyze data to determine why students are at-risk, assign interventions based on identified need and then provide and monitor interventions. EWIMS will be integrated into the five-step OIP, districts will inventory and catalog currently available and newly identified supports and interventions for efficient assignment and monitoring. The inventory will be housed in a PDF for year 1 of the project until a Student Supports and Intervention Inventory Tool is available within ODDEX. SST implementation teams are being trained in a coaching framework developed by Michael Siebersma to use when working with the districts. The framework includes building trust and relationships, using effective communication through questions and active listening and supporting the right work by encouraging focused goal setting and enacting follow-through.

Predictors of Postschool Success for Students with Disabilities

Research has produced a consistent set of predictors of in-school activities that positively correlate with post-school success in education, employment and independent living (e.g., program of study, career technical education, career awareness, paid employment/work experience,). The essential program characteristics and operational definitions of these predictors have also been identified. SSIP activities have been aligned to these essential program characteristics so that postschool outcomes correlated to the predictors can be realized. The predictor and the aligned SSIP activities are described below.

- Program of study is a research-based predictor of post-school employment. A program of study is an individualized set of courses, experiences and curriculum designed to develop students' academic and functional achievement to support the attainment of students' desired post-school goals. SSIP activities to address this essential program characteristic are related to adolescent literacy and mathematics support. Specifically, participating districts will develop and implement a Local Literacy Plan and high schools will also create an English-Language Arts intervention period provided by a trained professional. Additionally, 7th grade, 8th grade and high school math teachers will collaboratively identify strategies to close high school student learning gaps in mathematics based on Algebra 1 formative assessment and end of course data.

- Participation in Career-Technical Education is an evidence-based predictor of post-school employment and research-based predictor of post-school education. Career Technical Education is a sequence of courses that prepares students for a specific job or career at various levels from trade or craft positions to technical, business, or professional careers. Participating districts will complete the Serving Students with Disabilities in Career Technical Pathways Self Review Tool during which a collaborative team will review district policies and practices related to recruitment, application and selection (admissions), and provision of special education services within career-technical pathways.
- Career Awareness is a promising predictor of post-school education. Participation in occupational courses is a promising predictor of post-school education and employment. Each district in Ohio is required to have a career advising policy. Among many other areas, the policy addresses essential program characteristics within the career awareness and occupational course predictors. Districts within the SSIP will enhance current career advising policies to ensure the policy includes all components required by state law and amplify research-based indicators of attendance, course performance and behavior within the EWS Tool to identify students in grades 6-12 at-risk of dropping out and place them on a Student Success Plan.
- Paid employment/work experience is a promising predictor of post-school independent living and research-based predictor of post-school education and employment. Work study is a research-based predictor of post-school employment. Ohio districts are required to have a Business Advisory Plan in place and participate in Business Advisory Councils. To address essential program characteristics of paid employment/work experience and work study, districts within the SSIP will ensure that Business Advisory Plan goals meet required quality practices and are accessible to all students, including those with disabilities. The Business Advisory Council will also meet at least quarterly and include representatives from special education.
- Parent expectation is a research-based predictor of post-school employment. Students with disabilities who had parents who expected them to get a paid job were more likely to be engaged in post-school employment and education. Parent involvement is a promising indicator of post-school employment. It means active and knowledgeable participation in all aspects of transition planning. Interagency collaboration as a promising indicator of post-school education and employment is a clear, purposeful, and carefully designed process that promotes cross agency, cross program, and cross disciplinary collaborative efforts that lead to tangible transition outcomes for youth. Essential program characteristics will be addressed within the Establishing Families as Partners in the Secondary Transition Planning Process learning experience. This seven-part series will be facilitated by regional cross-agency teams and presented to cross-agency teams at each participating district during year two of project implementation.
- Exit exam/high-school diploma status is a promising predictor of post-school employment. High School Diploma status is achieved by completing the requirements of the state awarding the diploma including the completion of necessary core curriculum credits. Ohio districts are required to have a Graduation Policy which addresses several of the essential program characteristics of the exit exam/high school diploma status predictor. Districts are also required to complete and annually update a graduation plan for all students in grades 9-12. Participating districts will ensure there is a graduation policy in place that includes early warning data and Progress Toward Graduation Reports to identify students in grades 9-12 who are at-risk for not qualifying for a diploma and that students in grades 9-12 have a graduation plan. For students with a disability, this plan will align with the Individualized Education Program.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SIMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

Early Warning Systems Tool with research-based indicators and thresholds

The EWS Tool will be used by districts to generate reports that identify students who are at-risk of dropping out or not graduating. These data will allow districts to monitor the progress of all students and proactively intervening when students show early signs of attendance, behavior or academic problems which in turn will reduce dropout rates and improve high school graduation rates. The Tool will also provide the district with an efficient and effective method to identify students who are at-risk, allowing personnel more time to focus on providing evidence-based supports and interventions that keep students on track for graduating with a diploma.

Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (EWIMS) integrated within the Ohio Improvement Process

Districts will optimize their use of the EWS Tool and get students with and without disabilities back on track for graduation. EWIMS will be integrated into the OIP to ensure district, high school building leadership teams and teacher-based teams identify and provide interventions at the respective levels of the educational cascade and establish systemic collaborative structures. These structures will support the development and implementation of focused goals and strategic plans looking at both student academic and non-academic needs. As EWIMS implementation has just started, progress and will be described in future reports.

Predictors of Postschool Success for Students with Disabilities

- Program of Study: Participating districts will provide Adolescent Literacy and Mathematics Support to address high school student learning gaps in mathematics and English language arts. As a result, more student with disabilities will have an opportunity to meet graduation requirements and earn a regular diploma.
- Participation in Career-Technical Education: A collaborative team will complete the Serving Students with Disabilities in Career Technical Pathways Self Review Tool to ensure students with disabilities have equitable access to and service delivery within career-technical pathways and opportunities to meet regular graduation requirements.
- Career Awareness and Participation in Occupational Courses: District career-advising policies will include all components required by state law and amplify research-based indicators of attendance, course performance and behavior within the EWS Tool to identify students in grades 6-12 at risk of dropping out and place them on a Student Success Plan. Students with disabilities will have equitable access to all supports and interventions provided within the policy, including the Student Success Plan.
- Paid Employment/Work Experience and Work Study: Participating districts will ensure that Business Advisory Plan and Business Advisory Councils: address the needs of students with disabilities so that the students have equitable access to the same work experiences (e.g., job shadowing, work-based learning, internships and apprenticeships) as their typical peers. These experiences can be applied to competency and readiness requirements for graduation and lead to graduation with a regular diploma.
- Parent Expectations, Parent Involvement and Interagency Collaboration: The Establishing Families as Partners in the Secondary Transition Planning Process will help school personnel better involve and empower families to engage in the secondary transition planning process and make informed decisions that support their children's successful post-school outcomes. School personnel will also establish relationships with local agencies to collaboratively engage families and provide transition services.
- Exit Exam/High School Diploma status: Participating districts will have a Graduation Policy that includes criteria and procedures to identify students, including those with disabilities, in grades 9-12 who are at risk for not qualifying for a diploma. The policy will also include a process to notify the parent/guardian/caregiver that the student is at risk and a process to develop/support a Student Success Plan. All students in grades 9-12, including those with disabilities, will also have a graduation plan in place. A graduation plan will afford students with disabilities equitable opportunity to learn about graduation options available to typical peers that lead to a regular diploma.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric: To support districts with implementing the SSIP, the Department developed the Each Child On Track Expectations and Implementation Rubric. The rubric serves as a tool to document participating districts' completion of project

expectations and the level of implementation for each completed expectation in the SSIP project. The rubric consists of 12 indicators or areas of support for secondary students with disabilities, including shared leadership (e.g., teaming structures), legislatively required universal supports (e.g., graduation policy) and supports and interventions (e.g., adolescent literacy supports). SSTs will assist districts in completing the rubric each quarter and submitting the results to the external evaluator. The first use of the rubric is expected in January 2023.

EWIMS Fidelity Survey: District and/or school personnel will complete the EWIMS Fidelity Survey twice per year to monitor the fidelity of EWIMS implementation and drive action planning. The Department and the external evaluator will review the survey results to assess progress on implementing the EWIMS process at the school level. The EWIMS survey is adapted from previously developed EWIMS fidelity rubrics.

SST and District Capacity Surveys: Participating SST and DLT members will complete a capacity survey twice per school year to track changes in capacity over time. The capacity survey addresses key indicators of district and regional capacity including leadership, action planning, alignment/integration, professional development, content area knowledge and data use, among other areas. This tool, designed to measure key components of the SST teams' capacity to support local implementation, integrates components from previously developed tools.

As stated throughout the report, districts will begin to implement project activities after this report has been submitted. Thus, formal data collection has yet to take place. Anecdotal feedback from the SSIP design and implementation team, State Support Teams and districts as well as stakeholder groups indicate the project activities address areas that will positively impact performance of students with disabilities. Evaluations from State Support Teams professional development indicated the integration of the project activities into current district requirements will improve students with disabilities access to the opportunities and supports provided to typical peers.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Not applicable

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Early Warning Systems Tool with research-based indicators and thresholds

The SST and district data contacts will attend webinars on how to use the Ohio EWS Tool and run Progress Toward Graduation Reports in the Ohio District Data Exchange. It is anticipated that each district EWS Tool will be fully populated to run early warning risk reports and Progress Toward Graduation Reports for all student in grades 9-12. The next reporting period will therefore include an analysis of these data.

Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System integrated within the Ohio Improvement Process and Predictors of Postschool Success for Students with Disabilities.

Cohort 1 districts will begin implementing the seven-step EWIMS process within the OIP in January 2023. SSTs are currently assisting districts with forming the leadership team and ensuring that the team is comprised of individuals who represent key areas of EWIMS implementation and support for students with disabilities. The SSTs will conduct in-person trainings with DLTs on the Ohio EWIMS Implementation Guide and the policies and procedures outlined in the Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric. It is anticipated that each district will be operating within the "in-progress" category for implementation of each activity in the rubric for the next reporting period. The SST implementation teams will meet with DLTs to review and interpret district and building early warning data, assign students to interventions based on identified need, and monitor progress within interventions. SST implementation teams will meet with DLTs, building-leadership teams, teacher-based teams, or other entities to provide coaching based on identified needs. Both SST implementation teams and DLTs will show growth in capacity to implement EWIMS and project activities within the next reporting period. Cohort 2 SST implementation teams and district teams will be finalized in January 2023. The SSIP design and implementation team will provide professional development to build capacity for the SST implementation teams in spring 2023. The SSTs will begin implementation with the Cohort 2 districts in the fall 2023.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

This report describes foundational activities designed to address a new content focus in six cohort 1 districts. At this point, the external evaluator has not collected evaluation data to support modifications to the project's design or implementation activities. The SSIP design and implementation team and external evaluation team will systematically review the evaluation results to determine if modifications are needed. Any modifications approved by the Department will be reported in the FFY 2022 report.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment " Intro - Soliciting Broad Stakeholder Input on State Targets"

The SSIP start-up activities implemented during the current year focused on three important areas. The Department secured an external evaluator who developed a project evaluation plan. The evaluator is working with the Department to conduct a regional and district capacity assessment. Data from the capacity assessments will help the Department identify infrastructure needs at the regional and district level and help the Department with data-based decisions to improve state, regional and district capacity. The Department also designed and conducted professional development for regional implementation teams and Cohort 1 district teams. These implementation activities were shared with two primary stakeholder groups, state support team directors and the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The State Advisory Panel comprises forty-three members, of which twenty- three are individuals with disabilities or parents of students with disabilities. These stakeholders were engaged during multiple opportunities to review project implementation materials, the project evaluation plan and provided feedback informing the development and implementation of the project.

State support team staff play a critical role in implementing Each Child On Track and providing feedback to the Department on the effectiveness of implementation. The Department conducts a monthly meeting with SST directors and staff to solicit feedback on initiatives and plans, provide regular updates and provide opportunities for regional staff to ask questions and share resources. The State Systemic Improvement Plan is a standing item on the state support team directors' agenda. The Department provided regular updates on the Each Child On Track implementation plan, design activities,

professional development and resource documents developed to facilitate project implementation.

The Department conducted three webinars with state support team directors. The purposes of the webinars were to review the project's implementation plans and get feedback from the directors on implementation activities. The directors had an opportunity to review and discuss Each Child On Track implementation timelines for SST staff and district teams and provide feedback on the state support team and district activities calendar, implementation team expectations, EWIMS Implementation Guide, the EWS Tool and other documents. The directors also reviewed the District Memorandum of Understanding before disseminating materials to Cohort 1 districts. The Memorandum or partnership agreement outlines expectations for the Department and SST and articulates the responsibilities of district teams. The agreement also describes data-collection expectations and references fiscal support awarded to participating districts each year. The Department used multiple strategies, including group discussions and Jamboard notes to engage the directors. The directors shared questions regarding the data used to develop district selection criteria, implementation team expectations, participation in training for data leads and funding available to district teams. These discussions enabled the Department to clearly define implementation team expectations and district allocations before these materials were shared with implementation teams and district staff.

The external evaluation team was charged with developing an evaluation logic model and SSIP evaluation plan, including evaluation questions designed to provide timely feedback, inform the continuous improvement of the initiative and provide information about the outcomes and impact of the work. The external evaluation team met with the design and implementation team to explain the evaluation plan and related materials. The Department recommended reducing the number of questions and clarifying the process and instruments used to measure each question.

The Department also shared the SSIP evaluation questions with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. Panel members provide a valuable perspective on the utility of data collected to inform project improvements. The panel participated in a facilitated group discussion designed to provide context for Each Child On Track and frame the evaluation questions relative to the project's expected impact. Panel members also used guiding questions to structure small group or table discussions. The Department collected individual feedback from panel members. The panel expressed concerns about wording and recommended clarifying the intention of specific questions and simplifying "double direct or compound" questions. This feedback was shared with the external evaluation team, who modified the evaluation plan and questions accordingly.

The Department created an SSIP leadership team comprised of internal and external stakeholders. The director of each program area addressed by the project is represented on the team, including the Office for Exceptional Children, Office for Improvement and Innovation, Office of Graduate Success, Office of Career Technical Education, Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, Office of Whole Child Supports, and Office of Learning and Instructional Strategies.

In addition, four state support team directors are represented on the SSIP leadership team. The directors provide diverse perspectives to ensure that the project's outcomes align with initiatives across offices. The SSIP leadership team reviewed the materials and informed the design of the final documents, such as the district Memorandum of Understanding, the regional capacity survey and the evaluation plan. The SSIP leadership team will meet quarterly to review implementation activities and regional and district data and recommend strategies for continuous project improvements.

The Department will ensure regular communication with these stakeholder groups occurs throughout each implementation and evaluation stage. These stakeholders support data-based decisions, recommend mid-course improvements and advise the Department on developing strategies to disseminate project outcomes to external stakeholders including partner agencies, educational associations, organizations and families.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The Department utilizes a variety of strategies to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts across multiple projects. Strategies which are incorporated in Each Child On Track are summarized below.

The Department convenes monthly meetings with SST directors to facilitate ongoing planning and coordination across systems. These meetings include regular updates on the Department's activities and small-group discussions enabling Department staff to have a focused discussion and solicit feedback on various initiatives. The Department presents information about new initiatives such as Each Child On Track during monthly SST director's meetings. The Department will schedule a special webinar inviting SST directors to participate in a focused discussion and contribute to planning SSIP materials and activities.

The SSIP is a standing item on the meeting agenda and provides opportunities for directors to receive updates, discuss issues, react to proposed documents and provide feedback on relevant questions concerning the project. In addition, the SST directors receive a weekly newsletter which shares information about new initiatives and updates on ongoing activities. Each Child On Track presents regular updates on activities, upcoming events and other information needed from the directors. This newsletter is widely disseminated to select groups including partner agencies like the OCAL and institutions of higher education.

The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children has been an integral part of planning efforts for the State Systemic Improvement Plan. The panel provides feedback on the planning and implementation of the project. Panel members engage in small-group discussions regarding implementation of evidence-based practices and project activities, and review and discuss evaluation data. Panel members provide input on specific activities or professional development for families of students with disabilities.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Two additional activities which will be implemented next year are listed below.

- Project Success Stories
- State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) activities

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The external evaluation team will begin to compile Each Child On Track Success Stories in FY 24. The Success Stories will highlight positive practices taking place within the participating districts that may be used as a resource and motivational tool. Data for the creation of Each Child On Track Success Stories will be collected via interviews and focus group discussions. Related district data included in the Success Stories may potentially describe improvements in the rate of students who graduate with a regular diploma, decrease in dropout rates, improved implementation of Each Child On Track Expectation and Implementation Rubric or other overall measures of improvement. An expected outcome will be the completion of two Success Stories shared with participating districts, stakeholders and posted on the Department website.

The Department will begin to implement the SPDG in FY 24 which will include professional development activities that address the graduation rate for students with disabilities. It is possible that districts participating in Each Child On Track will take part in these activities which in turn may positively impact the SiMR. Data collection, measures and outcomes related to the SPDG will depend upon whether Each Child On Track districts are selected to participate in SPDG activities.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Each Child On Track implementation efforts are in the early stages. The design and implementation team monitors survey feedback from SST implementation teams and feedback collected during SSIP open office hours sessions to anticipate potential barriers such as challenges with adequate time to implement project activities with fidelity, timely completion of the EWS Tool and potential turnover in state, regional and local team personnel.

The SSIP design and implementation team is actively working with the SST implementation teams to address the areas listed below.

- ensure that SST implementation teams are comprehensive with representation from all subject matter areas
- encourage entire teams to participate in professional development activities and open office hours to share information and learn from each other
- work with the state support team and district data contacts to identify ways to pull the data from district student information systems
- provide stipends to support district-level "champions"
- provide weekly reports and status updates to keep all informed about project activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

SEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Department confirmed accessibility of the Theory of Action document, added this document to the Department's website and replaced the attachment with an embedded link within the FFY 2020 report. The Theory of Action can be found at the following link:
<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes/Ohio-SSIP-Theory-of-Action-Dec-2022.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

17 - 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 Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Jo Hannah Ward

Title:

Director office for exceptional children

Email:

johannah.ward@education.ohio.gov

Phone:

6147521378

Submitted on:

04/27/23 3:15:18 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
81.25%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	15	62.50%
Compliance	20	20	100.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	93%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	19%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	85%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	29%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	93%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	36%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	94%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	18%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	95%	1

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	16	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	67	0

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	YES	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.72%	NO	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	5.73%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.20%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	92.02%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.98%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	21
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data ⁴			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>