SPP/APR District-Level Data Reported to the Public

The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) in 2004 requires each state to have in place a State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B, and describes how the state will improve such implementation.

The SPP, submitted every six years, must include measurable and rigorous targets for the twenty indicators identified by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education. States must report annually to OSEP on the performance of the state on the targets identified in the SPP through an Annual Performance Report (APR). The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) submitted Ohio's most recent APR in February 2014 based on district data from the FY13 (2012-2013) school year.

IDEA 2004 also requires each state to annually report to the public on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) on a subset of the targets in the SPP. These required reports must include the state targets for each of the specified indicators, provide the LEA performance compared to those targets, and indicate whether or not the LEA met the targets. To meet this federal reporting requirement, ODE has posted an Excel spreadsheet on the department website.

The spreadsheet contains multiple columns for each indicator required in this year's district-level data report. As mentioned previously, this report presents **district-level data from the 2012-2013 school year**, specific to students with disabilities.

The annual report includes data for the following indicators:

Indicator 1 – Graduation Rate
Indicator 2 – Dropout Rate
Indicator 3 – Performance on State Assessments
Indicator 4A – Discipline Discrepancies
Indicator 4B – Disproportionality-Discipline
Indicator 5 – School-age Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
Indicator 6 – Preschool Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
Indicator 7 – Preschool Outcomes
Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement
Indicator 9 – Disproportionality Across All Disability Categories
Indicator 10 – Disproportionality in Specific Disability Categories
Indicator 11 – Child Find
Indicator 12 – Early Childhood Transition
Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition Planning
Indicator 14 – Post-school Outcomes

The spreadsheet has an "automatic filtering" function. This filtering makes it possible for a reader to see the results of a single district, or to see results from all districts having specific data between selected values or all districts within a specific county or region.

For example, if a reader wanted to see the data for Columbus City School District, he would click on the cell labeled "District" and a tiny triangle in it. A drop down menu of all cell values would appear; he would click on Columbus City. If the reader wanted to see all of the data for districts with a graduation rate less than 80 percent, he would click on the cell labeled, "Graduation Rate," and select *Number Filters → Less Than* in the resulting drop-down list. He would then type ".80" in the Custom AutoFilter textbox that appears.

The rest of this document provides a description of the spreadsheet's content and the sources for the data contained in it.

Reporting Conventions

When possible, data from Ohio's accountability system have been used for district-level reporting of SPP indicators. Thus, the columns for Indicators 1 through 3 contain the same Education Management Information System (EMIS) data used for creating the Local Report Card (LRC), filtered to reflect results of only students with disabilities (SWD).

"NR" indicates that the data for a particular rating are not displayed due to small group size (i.e., fewer than 10 students), in order to ensure student privacy. "NR" can also mean that the LEA reported no students for the indicator. Not all districts and community schools will have data for all indicators. For example, community schools that do not serve preschool students will not have data for Indicators 6, 7 and 12.

A very brief description of each Indicator is provided on the Excel worksheet tab, "Data Notes." Additional information is presented below. This description is not intended to provide all the calculation details needed to replicate the data posted. A complete reference for indicators based on LRC data (Indicators 1-3) is provided on the Local Report Card and Accountability Information page of the ODE website.

Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

This indicator measures the percent of students with disabilities graduating from high school with a regular diploma. States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The graduation rate is defined as the percentage of students receiving a diploma within four years after first being enrolled in ninth grade:

Calculation

# of SWD for whom a graduation date has been reported by the end of the 2011-2012 reporting period, and for whom data confirms course and testing requirements have been met

÷

Total # of SWD enrolled for the first time in ninth grade during the 2008-2009 school year

Note: Although this report is based on data from the 2012-2013 school year, OSEP aligned the data source and measurement for Indicator 1 with states' requirements for reporting graduation data to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the ESEA. Graduation and dropout rate data lag one year, therefore, Indicators 1 and 2 reflect data from *2011-2012*.

Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

This indicator measures the percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school. Ohio's dropout rate compares counts of students in grades nine through twelve who have left school without evidence of continuing elsewhere to the average annual enrollment in those grades:

Calculation

# of SWD in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades in the 2011-2012 school year who withdrew

÷

Total # of SWD in ninth, tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades in the 2011-2012 school year

Note: Indicator 2 reflects dropout data from *2011-2012*; see data note for Indicator 1.

Indicator 3A: AYP for Students with Disabilities

At the state level, Indicator 3A measures the percent of LEAs meeting AYP targets for students with disabilities.

As part of the ESEA Waiver, Ohio revised its accountability system and no longer calculates AYP. Ohio has transitioned to a letter-grade system for calculating annual measurable objectives (AMOs). 2012-2013 data serve as a new baseline for Indicator 3A. District AMO data will be reported under Indicator 3A in the 2013-2014 public report of SPP/APR data, to be posted in June, 2015.

Indicator 3B: Participation Rate

Indicator 3B measures the percent of students with disabilities who participate in statewide math and reading assessments. Data for this indicator are the same as those used to calculate the participation rate for the Local Report Card.

Calculation

# of SWD enrolled on the test date who took the math and reading assessments

÷

Total # of SWD enrolled on the test date who were required to take the test

Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate

Indicator 3C measures the percent of students with disabilities who scored at or above the proficient level on statewide math and reading assessments. Data used for this indicator originated in the AYP test results calculations. The math and reading proficiency rates are calculated as follows:

Calculation

# of SWD across all grades taking math [or reading] tests who scored at or above the proficient level

÷

Total # of SWD assessed in math [or reading]

These calculations are specific to students with disabilities who were enrolled in the LEA for a full academic year and are subject to the alternate assessment cap limitation.

The worksheet indicates whether or not the LEA met the state SPP targets for the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in math and reading. These targets were established using a federally-defined formula and represent the annual growth needed to reach 100 percent proficiency in each subject by 2014. These targets do not necessarily correspond to each LEA's individual AYP targets for the SWD subgroup.

Indicator 4A: Discipline Discrepancies

At the state level, Indicator 4A measures the percent of LEAs identified by the state as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. Based on guidance from stakeholders, ODE defined significant discrepancies in discipline rates as those in which the rate of suspension or expulsion for students with disabilities exceeds the rate of suspension or expulsion for nondisabled students by at least 1 percent.

Calculation

# of LEAs in which the rate of suspension or expulsion for SWD for >10 cumulative days exceeds that for nondisabled students by at least 1%

÷

Total # of LEAs in the state

At the district level, this indicator reflects the difference in the rates of suspension and expulsion for more than 10 cumulative days between students with disabilities and nondisabled students. Since discrepancies of 1 percent or more are considered significant, the targets for suspension and expulsion are differences of less than 1 percent.

Because the measurement for this indicator is based on the performance of all LEAs in the state, the worksheet does not reflect whether or not the LEA met the state numerical target, but instead indicates whether or not the LEA suspended or expelled students with disabilities more than nondisabled students at a rate of 1 percent or greater.

Notes:

- Data used for this indicator originated in the EMIS Student Attendance Record and Student Discipline Record. These data represent a comparison of percentages of groups of individual students reported to be suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days during the school year, using a minimum group size of 30 that aligns with the calculation of discrepancies for disproportionality. For example, if a student had three incidents, four days each, he would have 12 days, and count as one student.
- Total average enrollment of students is derived from the year-end attendance files. Counts are based on full-time enrollment of 180 days. Therefore, a student who was enrolled 90 days counts as 0.5 students; one who was enrolled 45 days counts as 0.25 students.
- Although this report is based on data from the 2012-2013 school year, OSEP instituted a one-year lag for discipline data. Therefore, Indicator 4 reflects data from *2011-2012*.

Indicator 4B: Disproportionality - Discipline

At the state level, Indicator 4B measures the percent of LEAs identified by the state as having: (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.

Calculation

# of LEAs with 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* policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy

÷

Total # of LEAs in the state

Like many other states, to identify significant discipline discrepancies Ohio uses a risk ratio method developed by a federal technical assistance center funded by OSEP. ODE identifies significant discrepancies in LEAs with risk ratios of 3.5 or above, using a minimum group size of 30 students with disabilities enrolled and at least 5 students with disabilities disciplined for greater than 10 days in the racial/ethnic subgroups included in the calculation.

LEAs with significant discipline discrepancies complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding student records, OEC determines if the LEA has policies, procedures or practices that do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

Because the measurement for this indicator is based on the performance of all LEAs in the state, the worksheet does not reflect whether or not the LEA met the state numerical target, but instead indicates whether or not the LEA was identified as having significant discipline discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.

Notes:

- This is a compliance indicator with required annual targets of 0 percent.
- See Indicator 4A, above, for additional information on discipline data that also applies to Indicator 4B.

Indicator 5: School-age LRE

This indicator measures the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served:

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

Calculation

A. # of SWD inside the regular class at least 80% of the day ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21

B. # of SWD inside the regular class <40% of the day ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21

C. # of SWD served in separate facilities ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21

Percentages are calculated from December Child Count data. Students with disabilities are included if the district reported:

- The student's age as greater than five; and
- A placement setting other than "placed by parents in private facility."

State targets for this indicator were set with guidance from stakeholders and are based on movement toward the national averages for placement in these settings.

Indicator 6: Preschool LRE

This indicator measures the percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

Calculation

A. # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program ÷ Total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs

B. # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility ÷ Total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs

Percentages are calculated from December Child Count data. All preschool students are counted in their district of residence, regardless of where their services are provided. State targets for this indicator were set with guidance from stakeholders.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

This indicator measures the percent of preschool children 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.

Data for this indicator are collected from the Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Form (ECOSF). LEAs report ECOSF ratings twice annually (in fall and spring) through EMIS. As part of the ECOSF summary, two assessments are required for all children with disabilities, ages three through five, served in preschool programs: the Get It, Got It, Go! literacy assessment and

the Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social-Emotional. Through a team input process, LEAs determine ECOSF summary scores using data from these assessments.

For each outcome area (A, B & C), LEAs must report:

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

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

Therefore, LEA data for this indicator are displayed in six target areas:

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes	**2012-2013 Target**
7a. Social-Emotional Skills	
Percent of children who increased their rate of growth	67%
Percent of children functioning within age expectations	49%
7b. Early Literacy Skills	
Percent of children who increased their rate of growth	69%
Percent of children functioning within age expectations	47%
7c. Appropriate Behaviors	
Percent of children who increased their rate of growth	68%
Percent of children functioning within age expectations	60%

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

This indicator measures the percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This indicator is measured using two surveys – one for parents of preschool children with disabilities and one for parents of school-age students with disabilities.

Calculation

# of surveys with average scores indicating that schools facilitated parent involvement

÷

Total # of parent surveys received

One-sixth of the LEAs in the state are selected for participation in the survey each year, in order to meet the federal requirement to collect data from every LEA by the end of the six-year SPP period. The number of surveys requested from each LEA is based on the number necessary to derive a statewide sample that is representative of Ohio's LEAs serving children with disabilities ages 3-21.

The worksheet for Indicator 8 only includes data for the LEAs that participated in the survey process during 2012-2013. Furthermore, in accordance with privacy guidelines, the worksheet only displays performance percentages for LEAs that collected 10 or more parent surveys.

To determine the percent of surveys indicating that schools facilitated parent involvement, OEC divided the number of surveys with an average response of 3.5 or above by the total number of surveys collected by the district. Each survey question offered five responses, and numbers one through five were assigned to each response as follows: 1=Very Strongly Disagree, 2=Strongly Disagree, 3=Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. The average response of 3.5 indicates that the parent agreed with more items than he disagreed with, and therefore reported a stronger agreement than disagreement with the concept of his parental involvement.

The National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, a federal technical assistance center formerly funded by the U.S. Department of Education, developed the preschool and school-age surveys for states to use to measure Indicator 8. The center completed extensive analyses to determine that the individual survey items, taken together, measure the concept of parental involvement.

Indicator 9: Disproportionality Across All Disability Categories

At the state level, this indicator measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Calculation

# of LEAs with disproportionate representation *across all disability categories* that is the result of inappropriate identification

÷

Total # of LEAs in the state

Like many other states, to identify disproportionate representation in special education Ohio uses a risk ratio method developed by Westat, a federal technical assistance center formerly funded by OSEP. ODE identifies disproportionate representation in LEAs with risk ratios of 3.5 or above, using a minimum group size of 30 that aligns with the calculation of AYP for racial and ethnic subgroups.

LEAs with disproportionate representation complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding student records, OEC determines if the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

At the district level, this indicator reflects whether or not the LEA was identified as having disproportionality in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.

Because the measurement for this indicator is based on the performance of all LEAs in the state, the worksheet does not reflect whether or not the LEA met the state numerical target, but instead indicates whether or not the LEA was identified as having disproportionate representation in special education (across all disability categories) as a result of inappropriate identification.

Additional notes on disproportionality requirements:

- In addition to representation in special education, states must also determine if disproportionality exists in discipline of students with disabilities and placement in educational environments, though only disproportionate representation *due to inappropriate identification* is required for public reporting as part of the SPP/APR.

- Disproportionality calculations are based on average enrollment used for the LRC and are specific to students with “attending home status” of 10.
- This is a compliance indicator with required annual targets of 0 percent.

Indicator 10: Disproportionality in Specific Disability Categories

Whereas Indicator 9 measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups *across disability categories* that is the result of inappropriate identification, Indicator 10 measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups *in specific disability categories* that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Calculation

# of LEAs with disproportionate representation *in specific disability categories* that is the result of inappropriate identification

÷

Total # of LEAs in the state

As with Indicator 9, for Indicator 10 ODE identifies disproportionate representation in LEAs with risk ratios of 3.5 or above, using a minimum group size of 30 that aligns with the calculation of AYP for racial and ethnic subgroups. LEAs with disproportionate representation complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding student records, OEC determines if the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

Because the measurement for this indicator is based on the performance of all LEAs in the state, the worksheet does not reflect whether or not the LEA met the state numerical target, but instead indicates whether or not the LEA was identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.

See Indicator 9, above, for additional information on disproportionality requirements that also applies to Indicator 10.

Indicator 11: Child Find (Initial Evaluation)

This indicator measures the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, whose initial evaluations were completed within the 60 calendar-day timeline.

Calculation

# of children with parental consent to evaluate whose initial evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days

÷

Total # of children with parental consent for initial evaluations

Data used for this indicator originated in the EMIS Special Education Event Record. Because this measurement is calculated from data submitted in the year-end reporting period, the denominator only includes students with a consent date more than 60 days prior to the June 1

cutoff date, in order to determine if the initial evaluation was completed within the 60-day timeline.

This is a compliance indicator with required annual targets of 100 percent.

Note: The June 1 cutoff is used to ensure that LEA personnel have sufficient time between the actual special education events and the end of the reporting period to transfer information from the special education records (which are often paper-based) into EMIS.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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

"Part C" refers to early intervention services administered by the Ohio Department of Health for infants and toddlers at risk for or diagnosed with conditions that generally necessitate special education. "Part B" refers to special education services administered by the Ohio Department of Education for children ages 3 through 21.

Calculation

# of children found eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

÷

Total # of children found eligible for Part B

Data used for this indicator originated in the EMIS Special Education Event Record. The denominator represents the number of children with preschool transition conferences determined eligible for services; the numerator represents the number of these children with initial IEPs completed on or before their third birthdays.

Because this measurement is calculated from data submitted in the year-end reporting period, the denominator only includes students with a preschool transition conference that took place more than 60 days prior to the June 1 cutoff date, in order to determine if, after the 60-day evaluation timeline, the IEP was implemented by the third birthday for children found eligible for Part B services. (See the data note for Indicator 11 for additional information on the June 1 cutoff date).

This is a compliance indicator with required annual targets of 100 percent.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Planning

This indicator measures the percent of measures the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes:

a) Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment;

b) Transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals;

c) Annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs;

d) Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed; and

e) 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.

Calculation

# of youth aged 16 and above with required transition components in their IEPs

÷

Total # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above

Data used for this indicator are collected in the EMIS Special Education Event Record and compared to EMIS year-end enrollment files. Because this measurement is calculated from data submitted in the year-end reporting period, the denominator only includes students with disabilities who were 16 on or before the June 1 cutoff date.

This is a compliance indicator with required annual targets of 100 percent.

Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes

This indicator measures the percent of youth with disabilities who, within one year of leaving high school, are enrolled in higher education, participating in a training program, or competitively employed. This indicator is measured using two surveys – an exit survey conducted just prior to exiting high school and a follow-up survey conducted one year after exiting high school.

Calculation

A. # of youth enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school ÷ Total # of youth surveyed

B. # of youth enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ÷ Total # of youth surveyed

C. # of youth 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 ÷ Total # of youth surveyed

One-sixth of the LEAs in the state are selected for participation in the survey each year, in order to meet the federal requirement to collect data from every LEA by the end of the six-year SPP period. The number of surveys requested from each LEA is based on the number necessary to derive a statewide sample that is representative of Ohio's exiting students with disabilities.

The worksheet for Indicator 14 only includes data for the LEAs that collected follow-up surveys during 2012-2013. Furthermore, in accordance with privacy guidelines, the worksheet only displays performance percentages for LEAs that collected 10 or more surveys.

To collect data for this indicator, Ohio contracts with the Center for Innovation in Transition and Employment (CITE) at Kent State University, a nationally recognized center for transition services and training.