

Ohio's 2019 Special Education Ratings Process

The special education program in a district or school is the basis of success for students with disabilities. Annually, the Ohio Department of Education issues a rating on the performance of the special education program for each district and community school in our state. This is known as the Special Education Rating and meets federal requirements* for local education agencies that receive IDEA funding.

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

- Meets Requirements;
- Needs Assistance;
- Needs Intervention; or
- Needs Substantial Intervention.

Districts submit final special education program data through Ohio's Education Management Information System (EMIS). The Department used the data for the 2017-2018 school year to create each district's [Special Education Profile](#) in December 2018. These data are the basis for the 2019 rating.

Special Education Ratings have historically been based on measures of procedural compliance. Starting in 2018, these ratings now include measures of results for students with disabilities.

*Section 300.600(a)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA)

Rating Criteria

The 2019 rating assesses districts' performance on the following measures:

Results Indicators

- Math proficiency rate for students with disabilities (across all grades);
- Reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities (across all grades); and
- Third grade reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities.

Compliance Indicators

- Disproportionality in discipline rates (Indicator 4b);
- Disproportionality in special education (Indicator 9);
- Disproportionality in specific disability categories (Indicator 10);
- Initial evaluation timelines (Indicator 11);
- Early childhood transition (Indicator 12);
- Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13);
- Timely correction of noncompliance (Indicator 15);
- Timely and accurate data reporting (Indicator 20); and
- IDEA audit findings.

Future ratings also will include:

- The percent of students with disabilities graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities; and
- Alternate assessment rates.

Enforcement Actions

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

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

Category	Enforcement Actions
Needs Assistance (Year 1)	Inform districts of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources.
Needs Assistance (Year 2)	Require a district self-review and corrective action plan to address compliance indicator(s) with lower scores.
Needs Intervention	Require a district self-review and corrective action plan to address the compliance and/or student results indicator(s) with lower scores.
Needs Substantial Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withhold, in whole or in part, any Part B funds; • Require completion of specific corrective actions before release of funds; and • Require intensive SST support.

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

Calculating Ratings

To determine each district's overall rating, the Department:

- 1) Totals the points across the compliance measures and divides that total by the number of measures for which the district has data. (That total can be up to nine, not every district has data for every measure each year.) This is the **compliance score**.
- 2) Totals the points across the results measures and divides that total by the number of measures for which the district has data. (That total can be up to three.) This is the **results score**.

3) Calculates an average of the compliance score and results score to arrive at an **overall score**.

The overall score corresponds to a point range for each rating category, as follows:

Overall Score	2019 Rating
3.75 – 4.00 points	Meets Requirements
3.00 – 3.74 points	Needs Assistance
1.25 – 2.99 points	Needs Intervention
<1.25 points	Needs Substantial Intervention

Performance on Compliance Indicators

Indicator 4b: Disproportionality - Discipline

Target: Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.50

Indicator 4b - 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 IEPs and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS Student Attendance Record, Student Discipline Record, and year-end enrollment files; calculated to identify districts with significant discrepancies.
Notes	<p>The measurement for Indicator 4b requires two steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Department identifies significant discipline discrepancies in districts with risk ratios greater than 3.50. 2. Districts with significant discipline discrepancies complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding student records, the Department determines if the district has policies, procedures or practices that do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

Indicator 4b Points	Criteria
4	District does not have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school

Indicator 4b Points	Criteria
	year for children with IEPs <i>and</i> policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.
1	District has a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs <i>and</i> policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.
NR	District does not meet the minimum group size of 30 SWD enrolled and at least 5 SWD disciplined for greater than 10 days in the racial/ethnic subgroups included in the calculation.

Indicator 9: Disproportionality - All Categories

Target: Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.50

Indicator 9 - Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS year-end enrollment files and calculated to identify districts with significant risk ratios.
Notes	<p>The measurement for Indicator 9 requires two steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Department identifies disproportionate representation <i>across disability categories</i> in districts with risk ratios greater than 3.50, using a minimum group size of 30 SWD enrolled in the racial/ethnic subgroups included in the calculation. 2. Districts 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, the Department determines if the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

Indicator 9 Points	Criteria
4	District does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (across disability categories).

Indicator 9 Points	Criteria
1	District has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (across disability categories).
NR	District does not meet the minimum group size of 30.

Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Specific Disability Categories

Target: Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.50

Indicator 10 - Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS year-end enrollment files and calculated to identify districts with significant risk ratios.
Notes	<p>The measurement for Indicator 10 requires two steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Department identifies disproportionate representation <i>in specific disability categories</i> in districts with risk ratios greater than 3.50, using a minimum group size of 30 SWD enrolled in the racial/ethnic subgroups included in the calculation. 2. Districts 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, the Department determines if the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

Indicator 10 Points	Criteria
4	District does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (in specific disability categories).
1	District has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (in specific disability categories).
NR	District does not meet the minimum group size of 30.

Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations

Target: 100%

Indicator 11 – Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 calendar days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.
Notes	There is no minimum group size used; all districts with at least one initial evaluation in 2017-2018 receive a score for Indicator 11.

Indicator 11 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94%
2	50 – 74%
1	0 – 49%
NR	0 students with initial evaluations in 2017-2018

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

Target: 100%

Indicator 12 – 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.	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.
Notes	<p>There is no minimum group size used; all districts with at least one student transitioning from Part C to B in 2017-2018 receive a score for Indicator 12.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2020 ratings (based on 2018-2019 data), districts with systemic underreporting of students transitioning from Part C, identified through review by the Office of Early Learning and School Readiness, will automatically receive a score of 2.</p>

Indicator 12 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94%
2	50 – 74%
1	0 – 49%
NR	0 students transitioning from Part C to Part B in 2017-2018

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Target: 100%

<p>Indicator 13 - Percent of youth with IEPs age 16 and above with an IEP that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment; 2. Transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; 3. Annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs; 4. Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed; and 5. Evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. 	
Data Source	Data collected in 2017-2018 EMIS year-end enrollment files and the Special Education Event Record.
Notes	<p>There is no minimum group size used; all districts with at least one student with a disability age 16 or above in 2017-2018 receive a score for Indicator 13.</p> <p>Although transition planning and services are required beginning at age 14 in Ohio, the federal indicator is specific to students with disabilities ages 16 and above.</p>

Indicator 13 Points	Criteria
4	95% or higher
3	75 – 94%

Indicator 13 Points	Criteria
2	50 – 74%
1	0 – 49%
NR	0 students with disabilities of transition age enrolled in 2017-2018

Indicator 15: Timely Correction of Noncompliance

Target: No late/uncorrected finding

Identified noncompliance is corrected within the timeline established by the Department.	
Data Source	Findings of noncompliance identified from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IDEA monitoring; 2. Indicator monitoring (Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13); 3. Fiscal reviews; 4. Selective reviews; 5. Complaints; and 6. Due process hearings.
Notes	Specific to findings made in <i>2016-2017</i> and due for correction in <i>2017-2018</i> .

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

Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data

Target: No data issues

District-reported data are timely and accurate.	
Data Source	Timely and accurate data reporting evaluated for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suspensions and expulsions (Indicator 4); 2. Initial evaluations (Indicator 11); 3. Early childhood transition (Indicator 12); 4. Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13); 5. Alternate assessment participation; and 6. Other EMIS data reported for students with disabilities.
Notes	Data are considered inaccurate if student records or other documentation do not match the data reported in EMIS, as determined through reviews completed by the Department.

Indicator 20 Points	Criteria
4	All data are timely and accurate.
3	One component of 1-6 is not timely or accurate.
2	Two components of 1-6 are not timely or accurate.
1	Three or more components of 1-6 are not timely or accurate.

IDEA Audit Findings

Target: No audit findings

IDEA Audit Findings	
Data Source	Single audits conducted by the Ohio Auditor of State's Office during the 2017-2018 school year.
Notes	Scores of less than 4 are assigned to districts with IDEA-related audit findings whose reports were released by the Auditor of State by July 1, 2019. Click here for examples of minor, moderate and major audit findings.

Audit Points	Criteria
4	No IDEA audit findings.

Audit Points	Criteria
3	Minor monitoring and/or reporting issues which can be easily remedied by implementing procedures according to Uniform Guidance .
2	Moderate documentation and/or reporting issues which would require revision of internal financial processes.
1	Major financial tracking issues which would require the initiation of appropriate financial and accounting procedures.
NR	Not audited in 2017-2018.

Performance on Results Indicators

(Included starting in 2018)

Indicator 3c: Math Proficiency Rate

Target: 29.00% or greater

Indicator 3c Math - Percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state math assessments, across all grades.	
Data Source	Performance on state math assessments in 2017-2018.
Notes	<p>1. These calculations are specific to students with disabilities who were enrolled in the district for a full academic year.</p> <p>2. Any district with fewer than 10 total students with disabilities assessed is not calculated and receives a result of "NR".</p> <p>3. The measure is based on the state's targets for the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in math. These targets were established based on recommendations from Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. These targets reflect annual improvement over the current statewide math proficiency rate for students with disabilities.</p> <p>4. Points are assigned based on distance from the target for this indicator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Districts who meet or exceed the target receive 4 points. b. Districts who are at or above the average of those who missed the target receive 3 points. c. From there, points are assigned based on standard deviation from the mean. Standard deviation provides a measure of how much performance varies across the state in relation to the target.

Indicator 3c Math - Percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state math assessments, across all grades.	
	d. Districts within one standard deviation below the mean receive 2 points, those who are 1-2 standard deviations below the mean receive 1 point, and those who are more than two standard deviations below the mean (i.e., a 0% proficiency rate) receive no points.
Indicator 3c Math Points	Criteria
4	≥29.00%
3	18.58 – 28.99%
2	10.95 – 18.57%
1	3.75 – 10.94%
0	0 – 3.74%
NR	<10 SWD tested in math in 2017-2018

Indicator 3c: Reading Proficiency Rate

Target: 24.68% or greater

Indicator 3c Reading – Percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state reading assessments, across all grades.	
Data Source	Performance on state reading assessments in 2017-2018.
Notes	<p>1. These calculations are specific to students with disabilities who were enrolled in the district for a full academic year.</p> <p>2. Any district with fewer than 10 total students with disabilities assessed is not calculated and receives a result of “NR”.</p> <p>3. The measure is based on the state’s targets for the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in reading. These targets were established based on recommendations from Ohio’s State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. These targets reflect annual improvement over the current statewide reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities.</p> <p>4. Points are assigned based on distance from the target for this indicator.</p>

Indicator 3c Reading – Percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state reading assessments, across all grades.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Districts who meet or exceed the target receive 4 points. b. Districts who are at or above the average of those who missed the target receive 3 points. c. From there, points are assigned based on standard deviation from the mean. Standard deviation provides a measure of how much performance varies across the state in relation to the target. d. Districts within one standard deviation below the mean receive 2 points, those who are 1-2 standard deviations below the mean receive 1 point, and those who are more than two standard deviations below the mean (i.e., a 0% proficiency rate) receive no points.
Indicator 3c Reading Points	Criteria
4	≥24.68%
3	17.03 – 24.67%
2	10.99 – 17.02%
1	4.94 – 10.98%
0	0 – 4.93%
NR	<10 SWD tested in reading in 2017-2018

Third Grade Reading Proficiency Rate

Target: 30.00% or greater

Third Grade Reading – Percent of third grade students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state reading assessments.	
Data Source	Performance on state third grade reading assessments in 2017-2018.
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These calculations are specific to third grade students with disabilities who were enrolled in the district for a full academic year. 2. Any district with fewer than 10 total students with disabilities assessed is not calculated and receives a result of “NR”.

Third Grade Reading – Percent of third grade students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state reading assessments.

3. The measure is based on the state's targets for the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in reading, across all grades. These targets were established based on recommendations from Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. These targets reflect annual improvement over the current statewide third grade reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities.
4. Points are assigned based on distance from the target for this indicator.
- Districts who meet or exceed the target receive 4 points.
 - Districts who are at or above the average of those who missed the target receive 3 points.
 - From there, points are assigned based on standard deviation from the mean. Standard deviation provides a measure of how much performance varies across the state in relation to the target.
 - Districts within one standard deviation below the mean receive 2 points, those who are 1-2 standard deviations below the mean receive 1 point, and those who are more than two standard deviations below the mean (i.e., a 0% proficiency rate) receive no points.

Third Grade Reading Points	Criteria
4	≥30.00%
3	21.26 – 29.99%
2	15.23 – 21.25%
1	9.21 – 15.22%
0	0 – 9.20%
NR	<10 third grade SWD tested in reading in 2017-2018

Graduation by Standard Requirements

Target: TBD

Projected Points: TBD

Percent of students with disabilities graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities.	
Data Source	2016-2017 EMIS Graduation, Assessment, and Student Collections
Notes	<p>1. This calculation will reflect the number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by meeting the same requirements for graduation as their nondisabled peers, divided by the total number of students with disabilities ages 14 through 21 reported as exiting school.</p> <p>2. Students with disabilities taking alternate assessments, excused from the consequences of the standard high school assessment, or graduating by IEP team decision will be included in the denominator for this calculation, but not the numerator.</p> <p>3. Included in the data extraction and calculations are codes from the Student Standing (FS), Special Education Event (GE), Special Education Graduation (FE), Assessment (FA), and Student Detail (FD) files.</p>

Participation in Alternate Assessments

Target: ≤1.00%

Projected Points: TBD

Percent of students participating in alternate assessments in math and reading.	
Data Source	2017-2018 EMIS Assessment and Student Collections
Notes	<p>1. This calculation reflects the number of students taking the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities in math, divided by the number of all students tested.</p> <p>2. A separate rate is calculated in the same way for reading.</p> <p>3. Each rate includes all students tested in grades 3-8 and high school.</p> <p>4. For high school, the math rate includes end of course exams in Algebra I, Geometry, Math I, and Math II. The rate rate includes end of course exams in English I and English II.</p>

Ensure Data Security

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

Appeals Process

Districts wishing to appeal their ratings must submit a completed appeal form and supporting documentation by **September 27, 2019**.

Districts or schools considering an appeal may contact the Office for Exceptional Children at determinations@education.ohio.gov.

Public Reporting

The Ohio Department of Education reports annually to the public on the performance of each district's special education program, including their Special Education Rating. The report containing the 2018 ratings is available [here](#). The Department will add the 2019 ratings to this report after the appeals period has concluded.