

# OH Part B

# FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">technical assistance and strategies to address needs assistance year 3.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:34 PM	

962

### General Supervision System:

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

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE), Office for Exceptional Children (OEC), in coordination with the Office of Early Learning and School Readiness (OEL&SR), has developed a system of general supervision that includes multiple levels to review the implementation of IDEA by the state's local education agencies (LEAs). The system is designed to: (1) Ensure compliance with the statutory requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Operating Standards for Ohio Educational Agencies Serving Children with Disabilities; and (2) Improve services and outcomes for students with disabilities.

### Data on Processes and Results

As part of the state's general supervision responsibilities, data are used to drive decision making about program management and improvement. OEC routinely examines multiple sources of data to track LEA performance and target technical assistance and resources that will assist LEAs and the state in meeting SPP targets.

### EMIS

Ohio collects and stores nearly all of the data aggregated for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) using its Education Management Information System (EMIS). EMIS is a statewide data collection system for individual student-level data for preschool, primary and secondary education, as well as staff and fiscal data. Much like the federal EdFacts system, EMIS provides specifications that are used to define elements and submission requirements. Each individual LEA purchases or develops software tools capable of meeting those specifications. Data are collected by the LEA, cleaned and aggregated at regional Information Technology Centers (ITCs) and passed on to the state EMIS databases. The state EMIS office provides many data verification reports that provide LEAs and ITCs with feedback about the validity of their data and makes available frequent opportunities for data correction during each reporting window. OEC's monitoring includes comparison of individual student records maintained by the district to the data reported in EMIS.

### LEA Special Education Profiles

Each LEA that serves students with disabilities receives an annual Special Education Profile. This document contains a summary of the LEA's performance on the SPP/APR indicators, identifies areas of noncompliance, and identifies actions the LEA must take to improve performance and meet compliance in accordance with IDEA requirements. The Special Education Profile includes trend data and graphs/charts which support communication of LEA performance among staff and facilitate root cause analysis of performance on specific indicators for continuous improvement. The data are not masked, even if they only represent the status of a single student's data record, so that LEAs can measure their progress regardless of size.

### CCIP

The Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) is a unified grants application and verification system that enables LEAs to look across multiple funding streams and channel resources to areas of greatest need. Each year LEAs submit CCIPs by completing the Planning Tool, which includes the goals, strategies, action steps and district goal amounts for all grants included in the CCIP; and the Funding Application, which LEAs use to describe their budget, budget details, nonpublic services and other related items. The CCIP supports LEAs in developing plans that align funding sources and involve parents, staff, teachers, administrators and community members in improving results for all students.

### Fiscal Management

Ohio's system of general supervision includes mechanisms to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the state and local level. These mechanisms include:

**Special Education Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for LEAs** - According to IDEA, Sec.613 (A)(iii), and federal regulation section §300.203, states must ensure that all LEAs expend for the education of children with disabilities in local and state funds, an amount which is at least the same in total or per capita, as the amount spent in the most recent fiscal year for which information is available. This is known as Maintenance of Effort, or MOE. OEC monitors MOE for all LEAs annually to determine if they are spending the same amount or more

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

of local and state funds on special education services as they did in the previous fiscal year. Any LEA identified as not meeting this requirement must submit a written statement explaining the cause of the discrepancy and describe the corrective action steps to be taken. OEC continually monitors these LEAs to ensure that funds are utilized according to federal requirements.

**Fiscal Reviews** - OEC utilizes the Fiscal Review process to focus specifically on how LEAs use their special education funds to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The Fiscal Review is completed by personnel from OEC and addresses the use of federal flow-through funds and/or state funds designated for students with disabilities and consists of the following components:

**Statement of Account Review:** OEC verifies that the district's financial report matches the Final Expenditure Report (FER) data submitted in the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning Application.

**Payroll Expenditure Review:** OEC verifies that the district charges IDEA payroll expenses to valid fund, function and object codes and it documents time and effort. OEC verifies that the district's special education staff is properly licensed to educate students with disabilities.

**Non-Payroll Expenditure Review:** OEC verifies that the district charges IDEA non-payroll expenses to valid fund, function and object codes; documents expenditures per district procurement policy (purchase orders, invoices, bids, etc.); and justifies that the service or item purchased will support the education of students with disabilities. OEC also verifies that the district has expended IDEA funds on behalf of students who attend nonpublic schools per the district's NS3 Consultation Guide and has a contract or a memorandum of understanding in place for all students with disabilities placed out of the district by the district.

**Equipment/Capital Outlay Expenditure Review:** OEC verifies that the district has in place and follows an equipment/capital outlay procurement policy. OEC also verifies that the district has expended IDEA funds on behalf of students with disabilities who attend nonpublic schools per the district's NS3 Consultation Guide.

**Child Find for Area Chartered and Non-chartered Nonpublic Schools:** OEC verifies that the district maintains records of the number of children attending chartered nonpublic schools within the boundaries of the LEA who were evaluated for special education services, the number of children attending area nonpublic schools determined to be students with disabilities, and the total number of children attending area nonpublic schools (both children with disabilities and those without). OEC also verifies that the district holds timely consultation with area nonpublic schools by reviewing data in the NS3 Consultation Guide.

**Public Participation Verification:** OEC verifies that the district provides parents with adequate notice of a public hearing to provide comment on how the district plans to spend its IDEA funds and that the district actually conducts the public hearing meeting.

**Redirection for Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS):** OEC verifies whether the district voluntarily opted to redirect IDEA funds for CEIS.

After completion of the review, OEC issues a report to the LEA detailing the areas reviewed, findings of noncompliance and any corrective action that the LEA must complete as soon as possible and within one year of the report's date (including the recovery of funds, if warranted).

### ***Integrated Monitoring Activities***

Ohio's system of general supervision includes integrated monitoring activities to provide oversight in the implementation of IDEA requirements and performance on SPP/APR indicators at the local level. Ohio's monitoring system is designed to:

- Investigate potential noncompliance using a variety of sources;
- Ensure correction in a timely manner;
- Verify that data reported reflect actual practice; and
- Ensure consistency with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02.

Ohio integrates effective monitoring strategies across all components of the general supervision system using various data sources and methods to monitor all LEAs. Monitoring activities are designed to ensure continuous examination of performance for compliance and results, both onsite and off-site. Monitoring protocols focus on specific priority areas selected according to SPP/APR targets and improvement needs. Ohio's integrated monitoring activities include:

- Compliance Indicator Reviews;
- Strategic Improvement Self-Reviews; and
- Selective Reviews.

All LEAs participate in some level of monitoring review annually. Each review method involves a different level of intensity and resources from both OEC and LEAs.

### **Compliance Indicator Reviews**

Compliance Indicator Reviews are conducted annually with all LEAs to identify and correct noncompliance with the following SPP/APR indicators:

- Indicator 4 - discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities;
- Indicators 9 and 10 - disproportionate representation in specific disability categories or across all categories due to inappropriate

identification;

- Indicator 11 - timely completion of initial evaluations;
- Indicator 12 - timely transition from Part C to Part B services with an IEP implemented by the child's third birthday;
- Indicator 13 - secondary transition planning for students with disabilities ages 16 and above; and
- Indicator 20 - timely and accurate data reporting.

OEC and OEL&SR analyze year-end data for these indicators to identify LEAs with performance rates indicating noncompliance. Each LEA that serves students with disabilities receives an annual Special Education Profile from OEC. The Profile contains a summary of the LEA's performance on all the SPP/APR indicators, identifies areas of noncompliance and describes actions the LEA must take to improve performance and meet compliance in accordance with IDEA requirements on the identified indicators. LEAs identified as noncompliant for specific indicator(s) must develop corrective action plans that include improvement strategies to ensure correction and must demonstrate correction as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the notification of noncompliance. As part of the review process, OEC reviews student records to ensure correction of individual cases of noncompliance, reviews additional student records to ensure systemic correction, and verifies that data reported in the Education Management Information System (EMIS) reflects actual practice.

### **Strategic Improvement Self-Reviews**

The intent of the Strategic Improvement Self-Review process is to maximize the use of resources that will result in better academic, social and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities and to meet regulatory requirements. The Strategic Improvement Self-Review is a four-phase process. The LEA conducts a self-review (facilitated by OEC and State Support Team staff) in the first phase. In the second phase, the LEA implements identified improvement strategies with the assistance of SST and OEC staff. In the third phase, OEC begins its onsite review activities in the LEA. Depending on the outcomes of the OEC review activities, the fourth phase is used for additional training and directed activities as needed.

### **Selective Reviews**

When issues of concern are brought to ODE's attention regarding an LEA's implementation of IDEA, a selective review may be conducted. A selective review is individually designed for the LEA based on the issues presented, however, the review still incorporates the primary review activities (parent/public meeting, record review, staff interview and data verification) conducted during a typical onsite review. The purpose of a selective review is to determine compliance with federal and state regulations and to assist LEAs in resolving specific issues or concerns.

### **Effective Dispute Resolution**

OEC ensures timely and effective resolution of disputes related to IDEA requirements through a variety of means, including IEP facilitation, mediation, complaint investigation and due process hearings. In addition, the office tracks the issues identified during dispute resolution to determine whether patterns or trends exist and to prioritize technical assistance activities.

### **Complaints and Related Investigation**

OEC encourages parents and family members to work with schools to resolve differences. However, situations may arise where parents or other family members believe the school has violated federal or state law. OEC, with the assistance of ODE legal counsel, has instituted effective complaint investigation procedures, allowing issues to be resolved in a timely manner. OEC investigates written and signed allegations concerning a violation of state or federal special education law. If the LEA is found in noncompliance, the letter of findings specifies the required corrective action(s) to be taken by the LEA. OEC's complaint process requires that all corrective actions must be implemented within one year. The complaint file remains open until corrective action is completed, while complaint investigators monitor corrective action plans to ensure compliance with timelines. If corrective action is not completed, the LEA may be subject to progressive sanctions. In general, the complaint process allows for the prompt resolution of complaints at no cost to either the complainant or the LEA and may be considered less adversarial than a due process hearing.

### **Due Process Hearings**

OEC is responsible for establishing procedures for resolution meetings and due process complaints, which provide a remedy for a parent or LEA in matters related to the identification, evaluation, educational placement or provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to a child with a disability. Within 15 days of receiving notice of the parent's due process complaint, and prior to the initiation of a due process hearing, the LEA must convene a meeting with the parent and the relevant members of the IEP team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the complaint. The purpose of this resolution meeting is for the parent of the child to discuss the due process complaint, so that the LEA has the opportunity to resolve the issue that is the basis for the complaint. Upon request, OEC will provide the LEA with a mediator for the resolution session to assist both parties in clearly communicating their concerns and how they are willing to address those concerns. If a resolution to the dispute is not reached at the meeting, the process moves on to involve the participation of an impartial hearing officer and attorneys and therefore may involve costs for the parent and the LEA.

### **Mediation**

Mediation is a voluntary process for resolving disputes between two parties. For mediation to occur, both sides must agree to mediate. This process is facilitated by a trained, impartial third party, the mediator, who helps the parties communicate with each other about their concerns in an effort to reach a mutually acceptable solution. To keep parents, advocacy organizations and schools informed about mediation and other conflict resolution options, OEC:

- Makes information on mediation available through the department website and through a toll-free phone number;

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- Provides information about the mediation process to LEAs, Educational Service Centers, superintendents, directors of special education/pupil services, and regional State Support Teams;
- Contacts parents directly to provide information on mediation when the parent files either a formal written complaint or a request for a due process hearing, or when parents inquire about conflict resolution; and
- Collaborates with the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Ohio Legal Rights Services, Ohio Protection and Advocacy Association, Child Advocacy Center of Ohio, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, State Support Teams, and the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution (CADRE) to disseminate information on mediation.

**Facilitation**

OEC also manages a facilitation process that takes place in a team meeting, such as an individualized education program (IEP) team meeting, evaluation planning meeting or an evaluation team meeting, at no cost to the parents or LEA. Facilitation may be used at any time the team cannot reach consensus concerning a student’s evaluation planning, evaluation or IEP. A party does not have to file a formal written complaint or request for a due process hearing to utilize facilitation.

While facilitation is not required by statute, it has been adopted by OEC because it can be less adversarial than a formal written complaint or request for due process hearing. The facilitator is a neutral third party who is not a member of the team and does not make any decision for the team. Having a facilitator assists the team in keeping the focus on the student. The facilitator models effective methods of communication and listening with the goal of enhancing relationships among the team members, resulting in improved services for the student and more effective communication among team members in the future.

OEC conducts training for hearing officers, mediators and facilitators on IDEA requirements and dispute resolution procedures. OEC also evaluates the mediation, facilitation and due process systems on an ongoing basis and makes revisions to these programs based on evaluation data and feedback from participants.

**Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions**

Supporting improvement and ensuring correction through incentives and sanctions are critical components of Ohio’s general supervision system. The enforcement of regulations, policies and procedures is required by IDEA and state law. State guidelines and directives also steer the technical assistance provided to ensure the correction of noncompliance and, ultimately, to meet state and local targets.

**LEA Determinations**

Parallel to the determinations that OSEP annually makes for states, states must use the same four categories to make annual determinations of each LEAs implementation of IDEA requirements. Determinations, known as Special Education Ratings in Ohio, evaluate the performance of each LEA against a subset of SPP/APR targets.

The IDEA Part B regulations at §300.600(a) specifically designate the enforcement actions that states must apply after an LEA is determined to “Need Assistance” for two consecutive years, “Need Intervention” for three or more consecutive years, or immediately when an LEA is determined to “Need Substantial Intervention.” Based on these regulations, the table below displays the enforcement actions required by ODE for determinations other than "Meets Requirements":

Category	ODE Enforcement Actions
Needs Assistance (Year 1)	Inform LEAs of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources.
Needs Assistance (Year 2)	Require training by SSTs with other LEAs in NA-2.
Needs Intervention	Require individualized training and technical assistance from SSTs specific to identified areas.
Needs Substantial Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Withhold, in whole or in part, any Part B funds;</li> <li>• Require completion of specific corrective actions before release of funds; and</li> <li>• Require intensive SST support.</li> </ul>

**Sanctions**

OEC has developed a system of progressive sanctions for LEAs identified with noncompliance that do not complete corrective activities within required timelines. (See the attachment for additional information on Ohio’s sanctions process).

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">sample special education annual rating.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:51 PM	
<a href="#">sample special education profile.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:51 PM	
<a href="#">oec progressive sanctions.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:53 PM	
<a href="#">ohio general supervision system.pdf</a>	Kara Waldron	1/30/2018 10:19 AM	

**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.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Ohio provides technical assistance 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 (see attached grant agreement). 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 compliance indicator data. SSTs use multiple years of SPP/APR data to identify patterns of strengths and weaknesses within each LEA and across LEAs located in their regions. SSTs also provide information and services regarding IDEA 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 issues related to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report results indicator data such as least restrictive environment and improving reading and mathematics performance of 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 designed to improve special education services and results for students with disabilities within specialized areas.

**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 new statewide Center for Sensory Disabilities was recently awarded to 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](http://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](http://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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">sst region map.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:53 PM	
<a href="#">sst grant agreement.docx</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/30/2018 9:10 AM	

### 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 students with disabilities.

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

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In November, 2015 and January, 2016 OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In December, 2016 OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR and SPP indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including SAPEC) 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 measurable and rigorous indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2015 (2015-2016) APR to the department website (see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan>).

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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. (See attachments for sample Special Education Profile and Rating reports). Special Education Profiles are now available to the public (with data based on small groups of students masked as appropriate) on the department's [website](#).

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">sample special education annual rating.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:59 PM	
<a href="#">sample special education profile.pdf</a>	Matthew Loesch	1/29/2018 3:59 PM	

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2016 and 2017 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2017 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, 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.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR.

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			83.20%	38.00%	84.60%	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%	75.90%	78.20%	80.50%
Data		83.70%	84.20%	83.90%	82.90%	82.90%	82.60%	66.90%	68.10%	68.90%	68.41%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	82.80%
Data	67.01%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.10%	87.40%	90.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The targets for Indicator 1 must coincide with those established for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reporting.

Detailed information about the stakeholder input into the content of, and calculations that resulted from, Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Waiver can be found at:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/School-Improvement/Federal-Programs/Elementary-and-Secondary-Education-Act/ESEA-Flexibility-Waiver>

In summary, stakeholders approved targets for the four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate that increase incrementally to reach the goal of 90% by 2018-2019. These targets apply to all students, including students with disabilities.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	14,118	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	20,293	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	69.57%	Calculate <span style="background-color: #cccccc; border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 10px; height: 10px;"></span>

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
14,118	20,293	67.01%	85.10%	69.57%

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Ohio students graduating in 2016 had the choice to use previous requirements or Ohio's new graduation pathways to earn a diploma.

Regardless of the pathway chosen, students were required to fulfill both course and testing requirements identified by the state of Ohio. A checklist has been attached that provides information regarding the original testing and course graduation requirements, including an alternative pathway for those who pass four out of the required five Ohio Graduation Tests. Information about the new graduation pathways for students to earn high school diplomas can be found at:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Ohio-s-Graduation-Requirements/Graduation-Requirements-2014-2017/New-Testing-Pathways-for-Students-Required>

Each district could impose additional requirements. The minimum state course requirements were:

- English language arts- 4 units
- Health .5 units
- Mathematics – 4 units
- Physical education - .5 unit
- Science – 3 units
- Social studies – 3 units
- Electives – 5 units
- Economics and financial literacy – included in other curriculum
- Fine Arts – two semesters

School districts were permitted to exempt students who participate in interscholastic athletics, band or cheerleading for two full seasons from the physical education requirement. Students must take another course of at least 60 contact hours in its place.

Mathematics units were required to include 1 unit of algebra II or an equivalent. Science units were required to include one unit of physical sciences, one unit of life sciences and one unit of advanced study in one or more of the following sciences: chemistry, physics, or other physical science; advanced biology or other life science; astronomy, physical geology, or other earth or space science. Social studies units were required to include ½ unit of American history and ½ unit of American government.

Electives units were required to include one or any combination of foreign language, fine arts, business, career technical education, family and consumer sciences, technology, agricultural education or English language arts, mathematics, science or social studies courses not otherwise required.

All students were required to receive instruction in economics and financial literacy during grades 9-12 and must complete at least two semesters of fine arts taken any time in grades 7-12. Students following a career technical pathway are exempted from the fine arts requirement.

In addition to the curriculum requirements, students must meet the testing requirement to earn a diploma. Students must pass all five parts of the Ohio Graduation Tests or receive adequate scores on end of course exams in English language arts (reading and writing), mathematics, science and social studies. Alternatively, a student may meet the testing requirements if he or she meets ALL of the following criteria:

- Passes four of the five tests and has missed passing the fifth test by no more than 10 points;
- Has a 97% attendance rate, excluding any excused absences, through all four years of high school;
- Has not been expelled from school in any of the last four school years;
- Has at least a grade point average of 2.5 out of 4.0 in the courses of the subject area not yet passed;
- Has completed the high school curriculum requirement;
- Has participated in any intervention programs offered by the school and must have had a 97% attendance rate in any programs offered outside the normal school day;
- Has letters recommending graduation from the high school principal and from each high school teacher in the subject area not yet passed.

Requirements have changed for future cohorts. For more information on the new requirements, visit <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Ohio-Graduation-Requirements>.

There are several adjustments to the state requirements available only to students with disabilities:

- A student may take an alternate assessment in lieu of the Ohio Graduation Test or end of course exams;
- A student may be exempted, based on his IEP, from the requirement to score proficient or above on the standard version of the Ohio Graduation Test;
- A student may be exempted from the consequences of not receiving adequate scores across the end of course exams;
- As a part of the transition planning process, 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 using education options, OR;
- The IEP team may decide that a student with a disability will meet graduation requirements solely by meeting the goals on his IEP,

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			13.70%	13.20%	13.20%	12.40%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	5.28%	21.90%
Data		16.30%	15.70%	16.10%	16.10%	17.10%	17.40%	4.70%	5.50%	21.60%	16.69%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	21.80%
Data	24.12%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	21.70%	21.60%	21.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

During the 2015-2016 school year, the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) worked with Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) to revise targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to change the measurement used for this indicator from Option 2 to Option 1, in order to align with the measurement used for state determinations.

At the November, 2015 SAPEC meeting a smaller work group reviewed an Indicator 2 fact sheet displaying historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregated dropout data based on student demographics. The work group discussed potential changes to data collection and reporting and proposed two options for targets with justifications for each. During the January, 2016 meeting the entire panel reviewed the proposed targets and justifications and voted to adopt the second set of proposed targets. Their justification can be summarized as:

- New tests/graduation requirements will be rigorous.
- There are several new initiatives designed to reduce dropout rates, including increasing the quality of transition planning, Student Success Plans for all students at risk for dropout (HB 487), and extension of career tech into middle school.
- It will take several years for new initiatives to show improvement.
- The targets are rigorous in comparison to the trend line, which suggests that without targeted efforts, dropout rates will continue to increase at a rate of 1.78% per year.

Prior to target setting, the panel discussed at length current initiatives in Ohio designed to reduce dropout rates.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	7,453	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	9,503	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	52	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	4,344	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	86	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4,344	21,438	24.12%	21.70%	20.26%

**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 his relationship with the LEA. The most recent withdrawal code for each student determines his 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, he is counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports him as not having withdrawn, he is 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, he is counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports him as not having withdrawn, he is 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? **No**

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			97.70%	98.00%	98.30%	98.70%	97.40%	97.40%	97.40%	98.50%	97.00%
			Data		98.60%	98.80%	98.80%	100%	98.90%	98.60%	99.10%	99.30%	99.03%	98.03%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			97.70%	98.00%	98.30%	98.70%	97.40%	97.40%	97.40%	98.50%	97.00%
			Data		98.60%	98.80%	98.80%	98.70%	98.70%	98.60%	99.10%	99.20%	98.95%	97.72%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	97.00%
		Data	99.33%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	97.00%
		Data	99.31%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	97.50%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	97.50%	98.00%	98.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the SPP. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "State Assessments and Discipline" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicators 3a, 3b and 3c.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how poverty, race and gender in various combinations affected the participation and performance of students with disabilities on state assessments. Near the end of the second day, the work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for those targets. Their justification for Indicator 3b can be summarized as:

- Ohio is above the national average in this area.
- Targets reflect a dip due to the anticipated impact of parent refusal and changes in testing accommodations on participation rates.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) Date: 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	20251	20319	20162	19395	19881	19819	n	n	n	n	25702
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4838	4560	4261	3889	4187	4231					6518
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12889	12987	13137	12607	12780	12609					16002
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2454	2609	2596	2686	2643	2651					2526

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) Date: 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	19553	20371	20149	19360	19859	19887	n	n	n	n	23479
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4559	4703	4378	3957	4197	4287					6191
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12409	12902	13015	12505	12732	12583					14188
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2458	2612	2599	2690	2652	2654					2523

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	145,529	143,660	99.33%	97.50%	98.72%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	142,658	140,794	99.31%	97.50%	98.69%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Ohio's Report Card Advanced Reports features allow users to aggregate and disaggregate student data by demographic characteristics and test types. To access this feature, connect to <http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/Power-User-Reports.aspx>.

Click "Begin," and chose the folder "Test Results." Any report with the word "disaggregation" in its title can be disaggregated by multiple student attributes, including disability category and demographic characteristics. The student attribute "disability flag" makes it possible for users to compare students in any disability category with students not identified. A report entitled "Test results disaggregated by student demographic and test type" allows the user to see the data for alternate assessments.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2015	Target ≥			57.00%	63.00%	69.00%	76.00%	82.10%	88.00%	94.00%	55.90%	38.56%
			Data		48.60%	51.60%	49.70%	48.09%	44.30%	54.30%	54.60%	54.60%	55.11%	38.56%
Math	A Overall	2015	Target ≥			47.00%	54.00%	62.00%	70.00%	72.70%	81.80%	90.90%	45.60%	34.19%
			Data		39.90%	45.40%	43.70%	43.87%	39.20%	45.70%	46.80%	43.10%	44.12%	34.19%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	24.18%
		Data	24.18%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	28.57%
		Data	28.57%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	24.18%	24.68%	25.18%
Math	A ≥ Overall	28.57%	29.00%	29.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) created an Ad Hoc Committee to discuss the adjustment of Indicator 3C's targets in light of the change in state assessments. The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) shared trends on test performance over the past three years for both typical students and students with disabilities. The Ad Hoc Committee then presented their ideas to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification for Indicator 3C can be summarized as:

- The group aimed to set rigorous, yet attainable targets for this indicator. Though rigorous, previous targets were not attainable.
- The group agreed that a single data point with the current assessment was not sufficient to set an appropriate target for next year, so the first target remains at the current baseline level.
- Targets for the next two years will increase by approximately .5% each year for both reading and math.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading proficiency data by grade

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	20181	20156	19994	19182	19610	19491	n	n	n	n	25046
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1685	1381	1304	791	671	436					832
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3753	3256	3488	2137	2020	1249					2457
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	2008	2229	2248	2277	2295	2289					1979

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	19426	20217	19992	19152	19581	19524	n	n	n	n	22902
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2009	1925	1180	930	634	817					424
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4491	4715	3176	2411	1959	2576					1172
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1581	1858	1944	1930	2000	1994					1879

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	143,660	40,785	24.18%	24.18%	28.39%

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	140,794	41,605	28.57%	28.57%	29.55%

### Public Reporting Information

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

Ohio's Report Card Advanced Reports features allow users to aggregate and disaggregate student data by demographic characteristics and test types. To access this feature, connect to <http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/Power-User-Reports.aspx>.

Click "Begin," and chose the folder "Test Results." Any report with the word "disaggregation" in its title can be disaggregated by multiple student attributes, including disability category and demographic characteristics. The student attribute "disability flag" makes it possible for users to compare students in any disability category with students not identified. A report entitled "Test results disaggregated by student demographic and test type" allows the user to see the data for alternate assessments.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			6.72%	5.10%	3.48%	1.86%	1.86%	1.86%	1.86%	2.00%	1.70%
Data		6.80%	12.77%	9.40%	9.40%	1.50%	1.86%	0.30%	2.30%	3.66%	4.41%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	1.40%
Data	5.21%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	8.77%	8.47%	8.17%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

The change in the calculation for Indicator 4 results in a new baseline for Ohio, making the previously established targets no longer appropriate. To adjust the targets for Indicator 4a, the Office for Exceptional Children started with the state's new baseline of 8.77% and applied the same increments of progress (i.e., annual reduction) recommended by Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (as described below) to the two remaining years of the current APR cycle.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "State Assessments and Discipline" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 4a.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how poverty, race and gender in various combinations affect discipline rates.

Near the end of the second day, work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- o This indicator is based on the number of districts removing students with disabilities more frequently than their peers.
- o By increasing the rigor of the targets, the stakeholders hope that discipline policies will evolve to be more consistent among districts.
- o Stakeholders believe that widening the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the results of recent legislation related to seclusion and restraint will reduce the overall frequency of removals.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 244

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
63	718	5.21%	8.77%	8.77%

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- 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 the 618 data/EdFacts submissions. The State collects student-level data about each discipline event, including type, reason and duration.

#### Definition of "Significant Discrepancy" and Methodology:

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 nondisabled students by at least 1%, based on a minimum group size of 30 for both students with disabilities and typical students, as well as a minimum of 5 students with disabilities disciplined. With this minimum group size, 244 LEAs were excluded from the calculation of discipline discrepancies.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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 LEAs discipline policies, procedures and practices. Areas reviewed by the LEA include:

- 1) The LEAs 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 LEAs 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 behavior 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.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.

OEC required each of the LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 4a to: (1) correct each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (first prong of correction); and (2) develop and implement a corrective action plan that included revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements.

After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices, 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).

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
47	47	0	0

**FFY 2015 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 of the LEAs with Indicator 4a findings identified in FFY 2015 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 of the LEAs with Indicator 4a findings identified in FFY 2015, 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).

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	2.70%	0.80%	0.70%	0.19%	1.20%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	1.20%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 468

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
32	7	494	1.20%	0%	1.42%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Beginning with the FFY 2016 APR, states may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size (if applicable). Ohio previously included all districts in the denominator. This new requirement changes the calculation and results in a new baseline for FFY 2016, as indicated in the Historical Data and Targets section. Since the FFY 2016 data represent a new baseline, the data are not directly comparable to previous years. The increase in the overall percentage for Indicator 4b is due to the decrease in the denominator from 999 for FFY 2015 to 494 for FFY 2016. It should be noted, however, that the number of districts identified with significant discipline discrepancies by race *and* policies, procedures, and practices that do not comply with requirements decreased from 12 in FFY 2015 to 7 in FFY 2016.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

**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 the 618 data/EdFacts submissions. The State collects student-level data about each discipline event, including type, reason and duration.

**Definition of "Significant Discrepancy" and Methodology:**

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 the Westat risk ratio calculation formulae. 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.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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 Asian 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 who are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.
- To identify discipline discrepancies, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) uses a 3.5 risk ratio, based on a minimum group size of 30. Thus, an LEA must enroll at least 30 students with disabilities in a racial subgroup and 30 typically developing students in order to be included in the calculation for this indicator. Additionally, at least 5 students with disabilities in the specified racial group must be disciplined to be included in the calculation for this indicator. With these minimum group sizes, 468 LEAs were excluded from the calculation of discipline discrepancies.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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 LEAs 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 behavior 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.


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.



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

OEC required each of the LEAs with Indicator 4b findings of noncompliance to: (1) correct each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (first prong of correction); and (2) develop and implement a corrective action plan that included revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements.

After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices, 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).

 The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
31	31	0	0

**FFY 2015 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 4b finding identified in FFY 2015 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 4b finding identified in FFY 2015, 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).

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2016 have corrected the noncompliance, 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect 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 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			48.10%	48.40%	49.00%	49.40%	59.80%	61.50%	62.30%	62.50%	63.00%
		Data		50.60%	49.98%	52.00%	53.80%	57.40%	58.50%	58.70%	62.00%	62.81%	63.92%
B	2005	Target ≤			13.30%	12.50%	11.75%	11.30%	12.00%	11.60%	11.20%	11.40%	11.10%
		Data		14.86%	13.83%	13.20%	12.80%	12.40%	12.00%	11.50%	11.70%	11.83%	11.79%
C	2005	Target ≤			6.10%	1.64%	5.50%	5.30%	3.60%	3.40%	3.20%	4.10%	4.10%
		Data		4.74%	4.09%	4.12%	4.10%	3.50%	4.50%	4.10%	4.10%	4.33%	4.04%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	63.50%
	Data	65.13%
B	Target ≤	10.80%
	Data	11.77%
C	Target ≤	4.10%
	Data	3.93%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target B ≤	10.50%	10.20%	10.00%
Target C ≤	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Educating Students in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 5.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how poverty, race and gender in various combinations affect educational environments.

Near the end of the second day, the work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. Their justification can be summarized as:

For the percentage of children with individualized education programs (IEPs) ages 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day (Indicator 5A) and less than 40% of the day (Indicator 5B):

- Ohio's performance is currently at or above the national average ;
- Ohio's data shows evidence of gains in district-level test performance as the percentage of students included in the regular classroom increases;
- Inclusive settings with appropriate supports are becoming more of the norm in Ohio's schools, but this takes time; and
- These targets should not discourage districts from providing a continuum of services in order to meet student needs;
- These targets follow the projected trend line if our current supports and improvement activities continue.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

For Indicator 5C, percentage of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served in separate facilities:

- Ohio's performance shows a flat trend line (with a single-year dip due to data reporting challenges in a large district);
- Some Department of Developmental Disabilities programs are changing services provided to school-age children;
- New special education community schools that serve only students with disabilities are increasing; and
- The committee needs to reexamine these targets in three years due to external forces, such as possible additional LRE categories for online learning and increases in parental choice and scholarship programs.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	236,718	225,621
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	148,475	148,475
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	27,989	27,989
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	6,886	6,886
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	298	29
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	1,270	1,270

### Explanation of Alternate Data

Ohio has a vibrant school choice program, and provides scholarship funding for students with disabilities to attend nonpublic schools. Since the inception of the APR, Ohio has excluded students being served in these environments and students incarcerated in the adult prison system from Indicator 5 calculations. For the 2016-2017 school year, 11,097 such students were deducted from the total number of students with IEPs reported in the EdFacts submission, resulting in the adjusted figures above.

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	148,475	225,621	65.13%	64.00%	65.81%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	27,989	225,621	11.77%	10.50%	12.41%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	8,185	225,621	3.93%	4.00%	3.63%

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

The State reported alternate data for this indicator. However, OSEP cannot accept the State's alternate data because an explanation was not provided regarding why the number of children with IEPs aged 16 through 21 in residential placements reported in the SPP/APR submission was different from the State's data reported under Section 618 of IDEA.

8/2/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Required Actions**

Since OSEP cannot accept the State's alternate data for FFY 2016, The State must provide the required data or an explanation in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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.

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

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									50.64%	52.20%	52.20%
		Data								50.60%	52.20%	55.04%	61.71%
B	2011	Target ≤									39.54%	38.50%	38.50%
		Data								39.60%	38.50%	36.54%	29.61%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	52.20%
	Data	67.05%
B	Target ≤	38.50%
	Data	23.44%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%
Target B ≤	38.40%	38.40%	38.40%

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Educating Students in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 6.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion.

Near the end of the second day, the work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- The slow increase in targets is based on a predicted decrease of availability of regular early childhood programs, due to changes in the funding of preschool special education in Ohio;
- Previous state funding methods supported classrooms with both special education students and their typically developing peers, while current methods are based on the enrollment of individual special education students;
- Ohio's proposal for a federal grant to increase full-day preschool classroom slots for typically developing peers, thus mitigating the changes in state funding, was not awarded;
- Some Department of Developmental Disabilities programs are changing how services are provided to preschool children;
- The two data points available prior to funding changes are insufficient to create accurate trend projections; and
- The stakeholder group should revisit these targets in a few years and Ohio should consider setting a new baseline in the future when more data are available.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

## Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	23,181	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">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</a>	15,827	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	4,535	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	516	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	15,827	23,181	67.05%	52.30%	68.28%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,054	23,181	23.44%	38.40%	21.80%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	67.00%	79.00%	79.40%
		Data					64.70%	82.30%	84.30%	83.00%	78.60%	81.56%	78.51%
A2	2008	Target ≥						48.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.60%
		Data					47.40%	49.30%	51.40%	46.10%	48.50%	48.88%	48.09%
B1	2008	Target ≥						67.00%	68.00%	68.00%	69.00%	79.20%	79.60%
		Data					65.90%	82.60%	84.30%	83.40%	78.80%	80.89%	78.56%
B2	2008	Target ≥						45.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	48.30%	48.90%
		Data					45.70%	49.20%	51.30%	45.90%	47.90%	47.61%	48.29%
C1	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	67.00%	67.00%	68.00%	81.30%	81.70%
		Data					66.90%	83.80%	85.60%	84.40%	80.90%	83.60%	80.73%
C2	2008	Target ≥						58.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	59.00%	59.70%
		Data					59.20%	60.50%	62.50%	57.00%	58.40%	58.16%	58.10%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	79.80%
	Data	83.09%
A2	Target ≥	50.20%
	Data	49.19%
B1	Target ≥	80.00%
	Data	81.87%
B2	Target ≥	49.50%
	Data	47.61%
C1	Target ≥	82.10%
	Data	82.16%
C2	Target ≥	60.40%
	Data	66.57%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	80.20%	80.60%	81.00%
Target A2 ≥	50.80%	51.40%	52.00%
Target B1 ≥	80.40%	80.80%	81.20%
Target B2 ≥	50.10%	50.70%	51.30%
Target C1 ≥	82.50%	82.90%	83.30%
Target C2 ≥	61.10%	61.80%	62.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Preschool Outcomes" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 7.



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion.

Near the end of the second day, the work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- There has been an overall increase in identification of preschool students with significant needs;
- Though ideal, a growth of 1% per year to reach 85% is not realistic;
- The criteria for including students in this indicator involve many more variables than the data measuring school-age performance. For example, many students' data are excluded because they did not have multiple data points with which to measure improvement; and
- The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and State Support Teams (SSTs) have provided ongoing training to improve inter-rater reliability in completion of the Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Form, but there is still work to do in this area.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5801.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	45.00	0.79%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	778.00	13.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2031.00	35.46%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2170.00	37.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	704.00	12.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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 or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4201.00	5024.00	83.09%	80.20%	83.62%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2874.00	5728.00	49.19%	50.80%	50.17%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	51.00	0.89%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	836.00	14.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2064.00	36.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2143.00	37.56%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	611.00	10.71%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4207.00	5094.00	81.87%	80.40%	82.59%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2754.00	5705.00	47.61%	50.10%	48.27%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	54.00	0.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	638.00	11.16%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1575.00	27.55%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2477.00	43.33%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	972.00	17.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4052.00	4744.00	82.16%	82.50%	85.41%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3449.00	5716.00	66.57%	61.10%	60.34%

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

The Office of Early Learning and School Readiness has determined that several factors contributed to the observed slippage, including:

- A large increase in the denominator of approximately 77%;
- A recent update to the business rules of when children count as exiting the preschool program; and
- A refining of the data analysis process to provide more accurate counts of preschool children who improved functioning.

**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

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** 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. See the attached [policy](#) for Ohio's detailed data collection procedures. In addition to the policy, the following resources are posted on [Ohio's Preschool Special Education webpage](#) to provide guidance to the field:

- [Child Outcomes Summary Form](#)
- [Child Outcomes Reference Guide](#)
- [Child Outcomes Summary Form Quality Assurance Checklist](#) and [Directions](#)

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	93.00%	93.20%
Data		90.40%	91.80%	93.80%	91.40%	94.00%	89.50%	92.90%	92.50%	92.03%	92.66%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	93.40%
Data	96.05%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Parental Involvement" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 8.

The Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion.

Near the end of the second day, work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- The state's performance is currently very high;
- It is highly unlikely that any sample of parents would be in 100% agreement; no matter how much schools do to facilitate parental involvement, there will always be a few parents who are not satisfied with the school's efforts; and
- Continued parent involvement activities through Ohio's State Personnel Development Grant should result in some improvement in this indicator, so the targets should not remain constant.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
570.00	598.00	96.05%	93.60%	95.32%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

78.68%

760.00

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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.

According to presentations made during Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) leadership conferences, the survey tools developed by the former National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring were designed to be comparable and both the preschool and school-age surveys use comparable scales, ensuring validity of the results. By using the following method to combine data from preschool and school-age surveys, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) ensures that the reported results are reliable:

- OEC assigns a number to each survey response (1=very strongly disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree, 6=very strongly agree). Invalid values are removed from the data. OEC then calculates a single score for each survey by averaging all responses.
- As a score of 3 corresponds to “disagree” and a score of 4 corresponds to “agree,” the 3.5 average indicates that either the parent agreed with more items than he or she disagreed with, or had a stronger agreement than disagreement with the concept of his or her parental involvement.
- OEC combines the number of school-age surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher with the number of preschool surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher to represent the total number of surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher.
- OEC calculates the percentage of parents surveyed who report that schools facilitated parent involvement by dividing the number of surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher by the total number of surveys completed by parents.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** No

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Difficulties in receiving responses has led to an underrepresentation of urban survey response rates and low socioeconomic status survey response rates. In the future, OEC will oversample these underrepresented groups to compensate for the lower response rates in order to improve representativeness of children receiving special education services in the state.

**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.**

The sample surveyed represents parents from one-sixth of Ohio’s local education agencies (LEAs) serving children with disabilities and is stratified to ensure proportionate representation from traditional districts, community schools, and state-supported schools. Each LEA uses the same roster sampling method to select parents to complete the survey. The extensive stratification process is designed to provide proportionate representation across the state in the sampling pool, in order to obtain a sample that is representative of Ohio’s population of children receiving special education services.

OEC examined the FFY 2016 survey response group to determine if it is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the state. This analysis revealed underrepresentation in response rates for children with disabilities in urban districts and those of low socioeconomic status within the sample (16.91% and 10.84% below expected, respectively). In the future, OEC will use the strategies mentioned above to increase representativeness in future response data.

**Was sampling used?** 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 for this indicator (sampling element) is parents and primary caregivers of children and youth with disabilities, ages 3-21, reported to ODE on the December 1, 2005 child count.

### 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 provided the sampling frame for categorizing and stratifying LEAs that provide special education services to children and youth with disabilities. OEC utilized 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 is reflective of LEA enrollment in Ohio during the 2005-2006 school year.

### Sampling Categories

Children and youth with disabilities in Ohio, ages 6-21, receive IDEA Part B special education services through the following operationally defined categories:

*Category 1*

Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs)—OEC recognized 611 districts as Traditional Local Educational Agencies when baseline data were collected.

*Category 2*

Community Schools—The term “community schools” is synonymous with “Charter Schools” in Ohio.

*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.

*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”), as well as other state funded institutions that serve children and youth with disabilities under IDEA 2004.

The four categories described above include 100% of Ohio’s approximately 247, 000 children and youth with disabilities, ages 6-21, served in IDEA Part B special education services. Table 1 shows the number of LEAs within each category, along with the number of students with disabilities receiving special education services.

**Indicator 8, Table 1: Numbers of LEAs by Category and Students Ages 6-21 with IEPs**

Category #	Category Title	LEAs in Category	Students with IEPs
1	Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs)	611	220,051
2	Community Schools	216	7,917
3	Cleveland & Columbus	2	18,221
4	State Supported Schools	3	371
Total		832	246,560

Children and youth with disabilities of preschool age in Ohio receive IDEA Part B special education services through the following operationally defined categories:

*Category 1*

Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs)—OEC recognized 252 districts serving preschool students with disabilities as Traditional Local Educational Agencies when baseline data were collected. This category included state supported schools serving preschool students with disabilities.

*Category 2*

Other Educational Entities—This category included regional Educational Service Centers and Joint Vocational School Districts that serve preschool students with disabilities under IDEA 2004.

*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.

The three categories described above include 100% of Ohio’s approximately 29,000 preschool students with disabilities served in IDEA Part B special education services. Table 2 shows the number of LEAs within each category, along with the number of students with disabilities receiving special education services.

**Indicator 8, Table 2: Numbers of LEAs by Category and Preschool Students with IEPs**

Category #	Category Title	LEAs in Category	Students with IEPs
1	Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs)	252	17,223
2	Other Educational Entities	59	9,410

3	Cleveland & Columbus	2	2,174
Total		313	28,807

**Sample Size**

The samples consisted of parents and primary caregivers of at least 383 children, ages 6-21, receiving special education services during the 2005-2006 school year, and parents and primary caregivers of at least 377 children of preschool age receiving special education services during the 2005-2006 school year. The sample sizes of at least 383 and 377 were determined using a web-based sampling calculator made available by Creative Research Systems, based on populations of approximately 247,000 children and youth with disabilities, ages 6-21, and 29,000 children and youth with disabilities of preschool age. The numbers of parents selected for the samples reflect a confidence level of 95%, with a confidence interval of + or – 5%. Using the stratification types described in the following sections, OEC selected parents and primary caregivers of 383 students, ages 6-21, and 377 students of preschool age, distributed proportionately. Tables 3 and 4 show the percentage of students with disabilities within each category and the proportionate number of surveys collected from each category, for students ages 6-21 and of preschool age, respectively. For each year of the survey cycle OEC will select the sample of schools and districts without replacement, but the sample size should not vary significantly.

**Indicator 8, Table 3: Percent of Students Ages 6-21 Served and Sample Size by Category**

Category #	Category Title	Percent of Students with Disabilities Served	Sample Size
1	TLEAs	89%	342
2	Community Schools	3%	12
3	Cleveland & Columbus	7%	28
4	State Supported Schools	<1%	1
Total		100%	383

**Indicator 8, Table 4: Percent of Preschool Students Served and Sample Size by Category**

Category #	Category Title	Percent of Students with Disabilities Served	Sample Size
1	TLEAs	60%	226
2	Other Educational Entities	33%	123
3	Cleveland & Columbus	7%	28
Total		100%	377

**Stratification Description**

To ensure that all eligible parents and primary caregivers of students ages 6-21 were included in the sample, OEC utilized a proportional selection process based on the following strata: (1) stratification based on special education enrollment in Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs), and (2) stratification based on school type (e.g., community schools, state supported schools) and school districts with an Average Daily Membership (ADM) exceeding 50,000 (i.e., Cleveland Municipal City Schools and Columbus City Schools).

To ensure that all eligible parents and primary caregivers of preschool students were included in the sample, OEC utilized a proportional selection process based on the following strata: (1) stratification based on special education enrollment in Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs), and (2) stratification based on school type (e.g., other educational entities) and school districts with an Average Daily Membership (ADM) of 50,000+ (i.e., Cleveland Municipal City Schools and Columbus City Schools).

OEC developed these strata: (1) to obtain survey data from parents of children and youth with disabilities receiving services in all types of LEAs irrespective of enrollment size, (2) to ensure that the widest range of LEAs could be included in the sampling pools, and (3) to facilitate the overall logistics involved with data collection. OEC could not employ one data collection strategy to serve all of these purposes simultaneously; therefore, the following sections describe the sample selection process and overall data collection strategy used for each level of stratification.

*1. Stratification Based on Special Education Enrollment for Traditional Local Educational Agencies*

This stratification level included LEAs in Category 1 – Traditional Local Educational Agencies (TLEAs). As indicated in Tables 3 and 4, in 2005-2006 TLEAs served 89% of the children and youth with disabilities in Ohio, ages 6-21, and 60% of the children with disabilities of preschool age in Ohio. As such, survey data were collected from approximately 347<sup>[1]</sup> parents of children and youth with disabilities, ages 6-21, served within this category, and approximately 232<sup>[2]</sup> parents of preschool children served within this category, reflecting the overall proportion in relation to the overall number of children and youth with IEPs served. TLEAs have been divided into six

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

representative cluster groups in order to align selection of these districts with the selection process used for Ohio's Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plans. Each cluster group will comprise the TLEA samples for the corresponding year of the process. Tables 5 and 6 show the number of LEAs within each cluster group, along with the number of children and youth with IEPs served within the cluster and the corresponding sample year, for students ages 6-21 and of preschool age, respectively.

**Indicator 8, Table 5: Number of LEAs, Students Ages 6-21 Served, and Sample Year by Cluster**

Cluster	LEAs	Students with Disabilities	Sample Year
Cluster 1	105	38,374	2005-2006
Cluster 2	95	31,598	2006-2007
Cluster 3	102	36,565	2007-2008
Cluster 4	107	38,926	2008-2009
Cluster 5	100	30,773	2009-2010
Cluster 6	102	43815	2010-2011

**Indicator 8, Table 6: Number of LEAs, Preschool Students Served, and Sample Year by Cluster**

Cluster	LEAs	Students with Disabilities	Sample Year
Cluster 1	37	2,700	2005-2006
Cluster 2	38	2,412	2006-2007
Cluster 3	41	2,854	2007-2008
Cluster 4	42	3,076	2008-2009
Cluster 5	41	1,940	2009-2010
Cluster 6	53	4,241	2010-2011

To ensure that the samples reflected LEA size and were representative of all LEAs serving children and youth with IEPs ages 6-21 and children of preschool age, each TLEA cluster group was partitioned into quartiles (the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles) based on the total enrollment of children and youth with IEPs within the cluster. The quartiles represent four groups of equal size. OEC calculated the number of LEAs within each quartile range, along with the number of children and youth with IEPs served within each quartile range. With this information, OEC calculated the number of parents to be administered the survey within each quartile range.

The samples for this stratification level must be comprised of all TLEAs within each quartile in order for each LEA to be included in the sample over the six-year period. The number of surveys obtained from each quartile will reflect the overall proportion in relation to the overall number of children and youth with IEPs served.

2. *Stratification Based on School Type: Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City School Districts, community schools, other educational entities, and state supported schools*

Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City School Districts

States are required to annually sample from all LEAs with an ADM that exceeds 50,000 children. During 2005-2006 this stratification level included two Ohio LEAs, the Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City School Districts. Combined, these two districts accounted for about 7% of children and youth with disabilities, ages 6-21, and about 7% of preschool children with disabilities receiving special education services statewide. As such, approximately 7% of the total samples were drawn from these two LEAs (approximately 28 surveys per sample). To ensure full coverage of these LEAs in the sample of parents and primary caregivers of students ages 6-21, stratification was based on school type: elementary, middle and secondary schools. The number of surveys collected from each school type reflected the overall proportion in relation to the overall number of children and youth with IEPs served within the district.

To ensure full coverage of Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City School Districts in the sample of parents and primary caregivers of students ages 6-21 and of preschool age over the six-year period, parents and primary caregivers of students will be selected from elementary, middle and secondary schools and preschool units without replacement. That is, the schools and preschool units from which parents and primary caregivers are selected will not be included in the sample for more than one year.

Community Schools, State Supported Schools and Other Educational Entities

Like the process used to select the number of surveys completed by TLEAs, community schools collected survey data in proportion to their respective populations of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, served in IDEA Part B special education services. Approximately 36 surveys were completed by parents whose children received special education services in community schools.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State supported schools also collected survey data in proportion to their respective populations of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, served in IDEA Part B special education services. One survey was collected from a state supported school for the 2005-2006 sample.

Likewise, other educational entities collected survey data in proportion to their respective populations of preschool students served in IDEA Part B special education services. Approximately 123 surveys were completed by parents whose children of preschool age received special education services by other educational entities.

### Participant Selection

OEC used the same process of parent selection for all stratification levels. After determining the required number of surveys per LEA for the samples, OEC sent a letter to the superintendent or administrator of the school district, community school, state supported school, or other educational entity to inform him or her of the need to establish a local contact to ensure proper dissemination of the survey. OEC provided the local contact with specific "decision rules" for selecting children and youth whose parents were asked to complete the survey. In general, these directions consisted of how to use the roster sampling method for the selection process. In each case, local contacts were asked to archive the list (printed or computerized) for future validation, if necessary, through ODE desk audits or onsite verification and monitoring activities.

### Instrumentation

To collect data for this indicator, OEC utilized components of the IDEA Part B Parent Surveys developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). OEC comprised its surveys of the IDEA Part B sections *Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents* (25 items) and *Preschool Special Education Partnership Efforts and Quality of Services* (50 items). (See attached surveys).

### Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected via dissemination of two parent surveys using several options designed to promote maximum response rate. LEAs were permitted to use a method of communication delivery already established with parents (e.g. surveys may have been mailed, or parents may have had the survey read to them, either by a same-language speaker/interpreter or another parent of a child with a disability).

The Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD), Ohio's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center, provided assistance with collecting survey information. Parents returned completed surveys to the Ohio Department of Education. ODE logged surveys in and sent them to OCECD, who input the surveys in a database and tracked receipt of the required number of surveys from each LEA. OCECD contacted LEAs, as needed, to prompt return of the required number of surveys. In cases in which LEAs encountered refusal or non-cooperation from individually selected parents, OCECD directed the LEAs to select additional parents to survey to obtain the required number, using the roster sampling method. Neither the LEA nor ODE connected survey responses directly to parents.

[1] The sample for this stratification level must be comprised of all TLEAs within each cluster in order for each LEA to be included in the sample over the six-year period. Table 3 lists a sample size of 342; however, in order to sample all LEAs within this category, the 2005-2006 sample size consisted of 347 surveys.

[2] The sample for this stratification level must be comprised of all TLEAs within each cluster in order for each LEA to be included in the sample over the six-year period. Table 4 lists a sample size of 226; however, in order to sample all LEAs within this category, the 2005-2006 sample size consisted of 232 surveys.

[3] The sample for this stratification level was comprised of one-sixth of the community schools, which allows for the sampling of all community schools within the six-year period. Table 3 lists a sample size of 12; however, the total number of community schools in 2005-2006 required a sample size of 36.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies it will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

### Required Actions

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2017 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 will take to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 706

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	256	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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).

**Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology**

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 ethnic or racial groups is determined using the Westat risk ratio calculation formulae. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that a child in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that a student in any other racial group will be identified. The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students identified as needing special education in a specified racial group divided by the percentage of students identified as needing special education NOT in the specified racial group. For example, the percent of all Asian students in an LEA who are identified as needing special education divided by the percent of all non-Asian students who are identified as needing special education.
2. OEC uses 3.5 as the risk ratio threshold to identify disproportionate representation.
3. OEC calculates risk ratios based on one year of data.
4. OEC applies a minimum cell size of 30 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. With this minimum group size, 706 LEAs were excluded from the calculation of disproportionate representation for Indicator 9.

**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.**

Using the criteria established above, OEC calculated risk ratios for all LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n-sizes and determined that zero LEAs were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. If any districts had been identified with disproportionate representation, OEC would have followed the same process outlined in Indicator 10 to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.10%	0.10%	0%	0%	0.10%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 828

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	0	134	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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).

### Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

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

- Disproportionate representation of students in ethnic or racial groups is determined using the Westat risk ratio calculation formulae. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that a child in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that a student in any other racial group will be identified. The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students from a specified racial group identified in a particular disability category divided by the percentage of students identified in that disability category NOT in the specified racial group. For example, the percent of all Asian students in an LEA who are identified with specific learning disabilities divided by the percent of all non-Asian students who are identified with specific learning disabilities.
- OEC uses 3.5 as the risk ratio threshold to identify disproportionate representation.
- OEC calculates risk ratios based on one year of data.
- OEC applies a minimum cell size of 30 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. With this minimum group size, 828 LEAs were excluded from the calculation of disproportionate representation for Indicator 10.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Number of LEAs Identified with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Using the criteria established above, OEC calculated risk ratios for all LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n-sizes and identified 3 LEAs as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Through the review process described below, OEC determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification for each of these LEAs.

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.

**Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification**

OEC utilizes the following process to verify and report data for this indicator:

- OEC completes disproportionality calculations and LEA notification in the fall of each year. LEAs receive notification through their Special Education Profiles 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.

OEC reviewed the LEAs' policies, procedures and practices related to the identification of students with disabilities in specific disability categories and determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

The State must report in its FFY 2016 APR on the correction of this noncompliance.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, not including correction of findings**

Please see the Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance section for this information.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

OEC required the LEA with an Indicator 10 finding identified in FFY 2015 to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements for students with disabilities, 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).

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

For the LEA with an Indicator 10 finding identified in FFY 2015, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

identified with inappropriate identification, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		93.60%	82.90%	86.90%	93.10%	96.00%	97.30%	97.70%	97.50%	98.31%	99.14%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.06%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
47,143	46,858	99.06%	100%	99.40%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	285
---	-----

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.

Districts chose from a list of noncompliance reason codes when reporting evaluations that exceeded the prescribed timelines.

Number of Days Late	Count of Records	Reported Reasons for Missing Timeline
1-10	171	Reported reasons included scheduling conflicts with families, staff availability during the summer months, and staff availability during the school year.
10-49	85	Reported reasons included scheduling conflicts with families and staff availability during the summer months.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

50-99	22	Five reported scheduling conflicts, one reported staff were not available in summer months.
Above 100	7	No identified reason reported, but most had multiple admissions and withdrawals into the same LEA.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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. OEC conducts random data verification checks among LEAs that report 100% compliance.

Data for FFY 2016 represent the year-end 2016-2017 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
120	120	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

For each of the LEAs with Indicator 11 findings identified in FFY 2015, OEC sent notification of noncompliance through the LEA's Special Education Profile. Each LEA was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. OEC reviewed initial evaluation data from a five-month period after implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance and a State-selected sample of student records verified the data reported in EMIS. 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 of the LEAs with Indicator 11 findings identified in FFY 2015, OEC reviewed student-level data to verify that the initial evaluation was completed, although late, for each student whose initial evaluation was not completed within the 60-day timeline, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).



**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		79.30%	90.20%	96.50%	97.40%	98.90%	99.20%	98.90%	99.10%	99.16%	98.58%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.02%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,174
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	847
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,297
d. Number of children 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.	219
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	764
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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	2,297	2,344	98.02%	100%	97.99%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	47
--	----

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.

The number of days beyond the third birthday when the IEP was developed ranged from two days to more than 200. In the sole case where more than 200 days elapsed, the district did not report a noncompliance reason. Other reasons for delay that districts can report include medical reasons, parental choice, scheduling difficulties, and lack of staff availability. All LEAs reporting noncompliance are required to complete the process described in the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" section.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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. Additional data - specifically 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.

The Office of Early Learning and School Readiness or the Office of Data Quality investigates each case of apparent noncompliance. If either office receives documentation that the data submitted through EMIS are incomplete or inaccurate, or upon investigation of codes reported elsewhere in EMIS, these data are updated. The data set used for the APR is then updated accordingly.

The Office of Early Learning and School Readiness conducts random data verification checks among LEAs that report 100% compliance.

Data for FFY 2016 represent the year-end 2016-2017 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
32	32	0	0

**FFY 2015 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 in FFY 2015 to develop and implement a corrective action plan. ODE reviewed Indicator 12 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 Indicator 12 findings identified in FFY 2015, ODE reviewed student-level data to verify that the LEA implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

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 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						99.50%	99.60%	97.90%	99.50%	99.26%	99.34%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.27%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
57,847	57,871	99.27%	100%	99.96%

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

- State monitoring
- 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 planning elements are reported as part of the IEP event record.

OEC conducts random data verification checks among LEAs that report 100% compliance.

Data for FFY 2016 represent the year-end 2016-2017 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

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?  Yes  No

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
72	72	0	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For each of the LEAs with Indicator 13 findings identified in FFY 2015, OEC sent notification of noncompliance through the LEA's Special Education Profile. Each LEA was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After implementation of corrective actions, OEC reviewed Indicator 13 data from a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance and a State-selected sample of student records verified the data reported in EMIS. 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 of the LEAs with Indicator 13 findings identified in FFY 2015, OEC verified correction of individual cases by verifying that the students reported without (or with incomplete) transition plans now have complete transition plans in their IEPs, unless the student is no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the LEA with an Indicator 13 finding identified in FFY 2014, OEC sent notification of noncompliance through the LEA's Special Education Profile. The LEA was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After implementation of corrective actions, OEC reviewed Indicator 13 data from a subsequent reporting period. The data reflected 100% compliance, and a State-selected sample of student records verified the data reported in EMIS, so OEC considered the LEA to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

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

For the LEA with an Indicator 13 finding identified in FFY 2015, OEC verified correction of individual cases by verifying that the students reported without (or with incomplete) transition plans now have complete transition plans in their IEPs, unless the student is no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							40.20%	40.80%	41.40%	34.80%	34.80%
		Data						39.60%	41.40%	33.80%	34.80%	33.70%	29.37%
B	2009	Target ≥							67.00%	67.40%	68.00%	70.60%	71.00%
		Data						62.70%	74.50%	61.60%	70.60%	69.87%	66.55%
C	2009	Target ≥							67.20%	67.80%	68.40%	79.30%	80.00%
		Data						66.60%	81.10%	67.10%	79.30%	78.38%	81.87%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	34.90%
	Data	36.45%
B	Target ≥	72.00%
	Data	76.61%
C	Target ≥	81.00%
	Data	83.95%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	34.90%	35.00%	39.70%
Target B ≥	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Target C ≥	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the SPP. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Post-School Outcomes" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 14.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to its assigned indicators. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and a few basic disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. Near the end of the second day, work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets.

As stakeholders set the proposed targets, they were reluctant to set targets that would be unattainable, particularly for Indicator 14a, which measures the percentage of students in higher education programs. Their discussions centered around changes in state legislation affecting both Ohio's graduation requirements and admissions requirements to state universities that took place after baseline data were collected in FFY 2009. Ohio's law changed the minimum state requirements to receive a diploma. In the past, students accrued 17 credits divided among several subject areas. New requirements include a traditional path to graduation by taking a specified number of courses, but the coursework now must include a minimum of 20 units, and those units include specific courses such as Algebra II, laboratory science, economics and financial literacy. (Individual districts may add additional requirements such as foreign language coursework, or community service projects.) Students can "opt out" of some of the specific course requirements by showing workforce readiness or by passing a career or technical exam, while students with disabilities can graduate by meeting their IEP goals. However, students who opt out are ineligible to attend most state universities. The three universities that will accept students who graduated by meeting other requirements are not located in Ohio's primary population centers. Thus, these changes have made college enrollment more rigorous, particularly for students with disabilities.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

SAPEC's considerations for the targets established for Indicator 14a included:

- The previous baseline data appears to have been an anomaly. It is unlikely that Ohio will be able to approach that benchmark in the near future;
- Higher education is not appropriate for all students with disabilities;
- Graduation requirements and related criteria for admission to state institutions of higher education have increased, which could affect the possibility of enrollment for many students with disabilities; and
- Ohio's overall enrollment of the general population in college is less than that of many states; it seems appropriate to consider overall enrollment when setting targets for this indicator.

The justification for Indicator 14b, which measures the students in 14a as well as those competitively employed, included:

- Many students with disabilities have medical conditions that preclude full-time employment; and
- The overall employment rates for Ohio dropped at the onset of the recent recession and have not recovered completely.

The justification for Indicator 14c considered and combined the same justifications described above.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	972.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	280.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	376.00
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)	48.00
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).	107.00

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	280.00	972.00	36.45%	34.90%	28.81%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	656.00	972.00	76.61%	73.00%	67.49%
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)	811.00	972.00	83.95%	82.00%	83.44%

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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: 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.

**Reasons for A Slippage**

Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS) project staff have identified the primary reason for slippage within the percent of students enrolled in higher education is an increased interest in working full-time among students leaving school. There was a 5% increase in student expectation to work full-time post graduation in FFY 2016 over FFY 2015 (44.50% vs 39.50%), but a reduction in expectation to earn 2-year and 4-year college degrees (4% and 4.9%, respectively). This increased interest in full-time employment and decreased interest in higher education is likely due to a strong labor market and a wide range of presently available employment opportunities.

**Reasons for B Slippage**

OLTS project staff have identified the primary reason for slippage in category B is the aforementioned slippage in students enrolled in higher education alone, given the cumulative effect of fewer students enrolled in higher education in category B when applied to category A. An additional contributing factor is the reduction in students obtaining competitive employment within one year of leaving high school, which decreased from 40.16% in FFY 2015 to 38.68% in FFY 2016.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? 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**

In Ohio, children and youth with disabilities 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.

*Category 2* Community Schools – The term “community schools” is synonymous with “charter schools” in Ohio.

*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.

*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), as well as other State-funded institutions that serve children and youth with disabilities under IDEA 2004.

The four categories described above include 100% of Ohio’s approximately 247,000 children and youth with disabilities, ages 6-21, served in IDEA Part B special education services. Table 1 shows the number of educational units within each category, along with the number and percentage of students with disabilities receiving special education services, based upon LEA enrollment during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Indicator 14, Table 1: Numbers of LEAs by Category and Students with Disabilities**

Category	Category Title	LEAs in Category	Students with Disabilities	Percent of Total Within Category
1	Traditional Local Education Agencies	611	220,051	89%
2	Community Schools	216	7,917	3%
3	Cleveland & Columbus	2	18,221	7%
4	State Supported Schools	3	371	<1%
Total		832	246,560	100%

**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



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 special education exiters in Ohio for the same year.

**Instrumentation**

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.

**Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?** No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

OLTS project staff from Kent State University annually analyze response data 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 special education exiters in Ohio for the same year. Only the African American subgroup showed significant levels of variance from what would be expected by chance (20.50% of total exiters versus 15.20% in the OLTS sample).

This variance may be due in part to the increased difficulty in reaching students who drop out of school, which is more prevalent among African American students. To address this, OLTS project staff have been working with LEAs to identify students likely to drop out in order to solicit additional information on how to contact them one year after exit. They will continue this strategy to improve representativeness in the future.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2016 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response**

Please see the FFY 2016 Data section for this required information.

**OSEP Response**

[Empty text box for OSEP Response]

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			50.60%	50.60%	51.00%	51.00%	54.50%	55.70%	56.40%		
Data		50.60%	77.40%	79.60%	52.50%	53.03%	49.12%	44.23%	36.84%	42.42%	43.04%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	50.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	40.00%	-	48.00%	41.00%	-	49.00%	42.00%	-	50.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the SPP. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Resolutions and Mediations" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 15.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data and projections of trends based on historical data. At the end of the first day's discussion, if work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, these data were provided prior to the second day of discussion.

Near the end of the second day, work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- The group prefers to use ranges for targets, as the efficacy of the resolution process depends at least in part on the nature of the requests, and not necessarily on the process itself;
- An increase in the upper limit of each range should be expected, as ODE has increased its efforts and focus on resolution and mediation processes; and
- The final target reflects a realistic expectation of a 1% increase in the ranges' lower limits, with a similar increase in the upper limits reflecting a rigorous expectation.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	23	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	56	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

8/2/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
23	56	50.00%	40.00% - 48.00%	41.07%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	72.00%	
Data		83.50%	68.70%	53.40%	78.80%	81.90%	75.80%	66.98%	78.33%	79.69%	72.97%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	75.84%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	75.00%	-	83.00%	76.00%	-	84.00%	77.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for the SPP. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators. The work group focusing on "Resolutions and Mediations" was charged with examining data and identifying targets for Indicator 16.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data and projections of trends based on historical data. At the end of the first day's discussion, if work groups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, these data were provided prior to the second day of discussion.

Near the end of the second day, work groups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The group's justification can be summarized as:

- The target increases are comparable to the expected trend, if currently implemented strategies are successfully continued;
- An increase in the upper limit of each range should be expected, as ODE has increased its efforts and focus on resolution and mediation processes;
- Current strategies have increased the numbers and training of mediators; and
- OEC is working with the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution (CADRE) to improve local capacity and alternate dispute resolutions.

The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	44	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	72	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	152	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)****FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
44	72	152	75.84%	75.00% - 83.00%	76.32%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		0.01%	56.00%	27.30%
Data	0%	36.70%	18.20%	17.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	30.00%	33.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

**SIMR 1:** The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on Ohio's Third Grade English Language Arts Achievement Test.

**Baseline, Targets and Results**

School Year	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Target	18.2%	27.3%	30.0%	33.0%
Cohort 1	18.2% (Baseline)	17.8%		
Cohort 2	n/a	34.7% (Baseline)		

**SIMR 2:** The percentage of all kindergarten through third grade students who are on track for reading proficiency, as measured by state-approved diagnostic reading assessments.

**Baseline, Targets and Results**

School Year	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Target	56.3%	56.3%	64.0%	75.0%
Cohort 1	56.3% (Baseline)	54.9%		
Cohort 2	n/a	62.2% (Baseline)		

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) made two adjustments, with stakeholder input, to the original SIMRs. First, the state of Ohio recently changed its statewide assessment, which required ODE to reset the baseline for the first SIMR. Second, ODE revised both SIMRs for measurement at the building level rather than the district level. Stakeholders agreed that it was appropriate to change the unit of measurement from "districts" to "schools," as it is more accurate to focus on those school buildings within the district where the early language and literacy plan activities are being implemented than to focus on the district as a whole. Districts participating in Cohort 1 may have only one or two buildings participating, which would not be representative of the district. ODE presented options for SIMR targets to the SSIP Stakeholder Team at their meeting on March 10, 2017. During the meeting, ODE staff reviewed supporting data with stakeholders and gave them time to ask questions, discuss the options among their peers, and vote using consensus on the most appropriate targets for measuring progress on Ohio's SSIP. On March 30, 2017, Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) reviewed the changes and voted to adopt the targets proposed by the SSIP Stakeholder Team.

**SIMR Statement 1**

- This measure is built on Indicator 3c of the APR, which examines reading proficiency rates for students with disabilities.
- The targets were established with Ohio's SSIP Stakeholder Team and the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, after review of historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregated data by student demographics.
- The targets align with the Indicator 3c reading proficiency targets that Ohio uses for all districts' annual special education ratings

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(i.e., determinations), specific to the third grade reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities.

### SIMR Statement 2

- There is already a focus on this measure with Ohio's Third Grade Reading Guarantee. Focus has increased with the addition of a letter grade component to each district's Local Report Card specific to this measure.
- ODE established the original and updated targetes with the SSIP Stakeholder Team and the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. To set the stage for target setting, ODE staff summarized the data analyses leading to the SIMR, key components of the infrastructure analysis, root causes for poor performance, and the proposed theory of action. The entire group discussed the recommendations, reached consensus on one set of targets, and voted to adopt them.
- The updated targets align with the new baseline data for this measure, due to revision of the SIMR for measurement at the building level rather than the district level for Cohort 1 schools.

### Overview

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report* for a full description of Ohio's FFY 2016 data for both state-identified measurable results.

### Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

#### Statement

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

#### Description

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

8/2/2018



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

[Ohio's SSIP Theory of Action](#) Ohio's SSIP Theory of Action

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

- Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
- The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
- The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
- Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
- Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see the attachment entitled *Ohio Part B SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report*.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

**Selected:** 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: Kim Monachino

Title: Director, OEC

Email: kim.monachino@education.ohio.gov

Phone: 614-752-1012