

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Ohio



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

932

General Supervision System:

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

See attachment "Intro - General Supervision"

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

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

Ohio's State System of Support

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

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

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

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

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

Specialized Technical Assistance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Professional Development System:

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

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

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargeteds@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

71

Parent Members Engagement:

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

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

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

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

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

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

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

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) currently funds 83 Parent Mentor positions throughout Ohio. Parent Mentors are parents of children with a disability who are employed by a district or educational service center to provide free support to other families of children with disabilities as they navigate the special education process. OEC guides the work of Parent Mentors and has contracted with The Ohio State University Center on Education and Training for Employment to provide ongoing oversight and professional development to all Parent Mentors. ODE continues to support and grow this program, which is unique to Ohio.

The Office for Exceptional Children has partnered with other offices within ODE to create a Families of Students with Disabilities webpage specifically targeted to families of students with disabilities. This new page will bring together existing resources for families in one central location on the state's website. The page is being created with stakeholder feedback from numerous parent groups, including the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children and the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities. There are plans to develop additional resources for families of students with disabilities, particularly in the areas of transitions throughout a child's educational career.

The Office for Exceptional Children has created a new family-friendly Evaluation Roadmap document, which will be translated into numerous languages and shared widely. This document includes links and important information about the role of the parent in this process and is planned to be developed into an interactive element on the Families of Students with Disabilities webpage in 2022.

The Office for Exceptional Children created a Family Engagement Team in 2021 to connect individuals across the office who are working on family engagement projects and supports. The purpose of the team is to share updates, collaborate and seek opportunities to support one another's work. Having a cross-office team focused on this work supports a better and more consistent understanding across the office about this work and greater opportunities to promote supports to parents. The Ohio Department of Education also created a Cross-Agency Family Engagement Team in 2021, which representatives from across the department who have work relating to family engagement. Although this group was just recently created, its purpose is to better align and cross-promote the many family engagement initiatives from the Ohio Department of Education. This group also plans to work on streamlining the resources on the ODE website related to family engagement to create better coherence and support easier navigation for both families and educators.

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

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including the state advisory panel) and through regional and statewide conferences. OEC will continue utilizing these means to report annually to the public on Ohio's progress and/or slippage in meeting the indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2019 (2019-2020) APR to the department website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan>). After submission to OSEP, OEC will post the indicator targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 to the target setting website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). In order to report to the public on the performance of LEAs located in the State on the SPP/APR indicators, OEC posted a report on the department website within 120 days after submission of the APR, as required (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Resources-for-Parents-and-Teachers-of-Students-wit/District-Level-Performance-Data>). In addition to the public report, each LEA annually receives a Special Education Profile, comprised of a data profile and required monitoring activities, and an annual Special Education Rating detailing its performance on the indicators included in the subset for making LEA determinations. Special Education Profiles are available to the public (with data based on small groups of students masked as appropriate) on the department's website (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Data-and-Funding/District-Level-Performance-Data>).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including the state advisory panel) and through regional and statewide conferences. OEC will continue utilizing these means to report annually to the public on Ohio's progress and/or slippage in meeting the indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2019 (2019-2020) APR to the department website, including any revisions to targets submitted with the FFY 2019 APR (see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan>).

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

Ohio has reported to the public on the state's 2021 determination, required actions, and improvement strategies through the department website, including distribution through news announcements and public agency listservs (see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Monitoring-System/State-Determinations>).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Technical Assistance and Strategies to Address Needs Assistance, Year 2

Ohio received a 2021 determination of Needs Assistance for the second consecutive year. Ohio's lowest-scoring areas continue to be graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities. The Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) has taken multiple actions to address these indicators. This work has been accomplished with targeted technical assistance from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) and is supported through state biennium budget Secondary Transition Enhancement funds, which are allocated to develop coordinated regional secondary transition services leading to improved post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. OEC has focused on building the capacity of school personnel and educational partners to develop secondary transition services and supports that will increase students' in-school and post-school engagement, as summarized below.

Key Improvement Strategies

1. Ohio's new State Systemic Improvement Plan will focus on improving graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates for students with disabilities. The plan includes implementation of an early warning intervention and monitoring system to identify students with disabilities who are at-risk for not graduating, matching those students with appropriate interventions based on identified need, and monitoring student progress over time.

2. In June 2021, OEC released the 11 District Plan in response to the Doe Settlement. This plan outlines increased supports for students with disabilities

in 11 targeted districts. However, the resources developed will be available statewide. Improving graduation rates for students with disabilities is a key objective within the plan, including a strategy related to parents' understanding of graduation requirements and options for their children with IEPs. Activities include school and family training on graduation requirements and development of a Graduation Decision Framework.

3. In March 2021, OEC released Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities. This strategic, statewide plan includes a focus on improved postsecondary transition and outcomes.
4. The Ohio Department of Education received a Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant to develop an Early Warning System and a Progress Toward Graduation reporting system within the Ohio District Data Exchange. These tools will be available free of charge to all Ohio school districts. These tools will also be used within the SSIP to identify students with disabilities who are at-risk for dropping out and those who are not on-track to earn a regular high school diploma.
5. OEC coordinates the efforts of 16 Secondary Transition Consultants and eight Career Technical Planning District Consultants within a regional state system of support. These consultants provide high quality professional development and technical assistance to educators in the provision of secondary transition services and serving students with disabilities in career-technical pathways. Each State Support Team is provided Secondary Transition Enhancement Funds to support strategies that address regional needs identified by the Predictor Implementation School/District Self-Assessment. The self-assessment is based on the evidence-based predictors and practices within the Taxonomy for Transition Programming 2.0, so this work is aligned with what research-based strategies to keep students with disabilities on-track for graduation and successful post-school outcomes.
6. Representatives from OEC and the Office of Career Technical Education sit on the Ohio Employment First Taskforce and jointly support competitive integrated employment as the first consideration for all students. Taskforce activities support stakeholders across Ohio to provide high quality secondary transition services so that all students, including those with significant cognitive disabilities, experience success in school and graduate to meaningful postsecondary opportunities.
7. The Ohio Perkins V State Plan includes strategies to ensure students with disabilities are provided equitable access to and appropriate supports to progress in Ohio's career technical pathways. Ohio's Indicator 14 data show that career technical education is an in-school predictor of postsecondary success for students with disabilities.
8. OEC leads a state cross-agency team that develops a Secondary Transition Plan each year with the assistance of NTACTION. The plan resulted in a seven-part learning series titled Establishing Families as Partners in the Secondary Transition Planning Process, which encourages agencies to target and include students' families in secondary and post-secondary planning. This work helps increase parent involvement, which is an in-school predictor of postsecondary success for student with disabilities.
9. The Ohio Department of Education and Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities have developed an interagency agreement to increase access to vocational rehabilitation services starting at age 14. The initiative is called The Ohio Transition Support Partnership. The Department's Ohio Transition Support Partnership Coordinator is based in OEC. The coordinator works closely with the Opportunities for Ohioans Transition Unit to complete activities such as providing cross-agency trainings and maintaining a data sharing agreement to track vocational rehabilitation service outcomes for students. Overall, the project provides students greater access to paid employment and work experience, which are in-school predictors of postsecondary success for students with disabilities.
10. Ohio's Alternate Assessment for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities Decision Framework has helped to reduce the number of students participating in the alternate assessment, per Ohio's state waiver and related strategies. Students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment are not included in the number of students graduating with a regular high school diploma (the numerator for Indicator 1). By reducing the high rate of students with disabilities taking alternate assessments in Ohio, more students with disabilities will be eligible to meet standard graduation requirements.
11. OEC has contracted with the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence to develop an Age-Appropriate Transition Assessment Tool. The tool will assist individualized education program teams to identify student preferences, interests, strengths and skills to develop postsecondary goals and transition services.
12. OEC offers competitive grant funds for school district collaboratives to create and implement Innovative Strategies for Developing College and Career Readiness for Students with Disabilities. Grant activities focus on the evidence-based predictors of parent involvement and student self-determination and self-advocacy. Grant teams produce products that can be replicated statewide.

Supporting state legislation:

1. Per SB 316, IEP's must include a transition plan beginning at age 14;
2. Ohio's graduation requirements for the class of 2023 and beyond offer multiple pathways to graduation, providing greater flexibility and allowing students to demonstrate competency through a variety of mechanisms;
3. Per ORC 3313.617 all students in grades 9-12 in Ohio are required to have a graduation plan in place;
4. Per ORC 3313.617 districts must have a policy in place to identify students who are at-risk for not meeting graduation requirements and to develop an intervention plan;
5. Per HB 410 school districts must have a chronic absenteeism policy.

Ohio will continue partnering with federal technical assistance centers, including NTACTION, the IDEA Data Center, the National Center for Systemic Improvement, and others to improve services and outcomes for Ohio's exceptional children.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	58.53%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	82.80%	85.10%	72.30%	73.80%	75.40%
Data	67.01%	69.57%	70.45%	51.37%	47.99%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children

Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 1 Target Rationale

- Reaching 70% by the 2025-2026 school year would move Ohio from the lowest-performing group of states to the middle-performing group of states in the annual ranking and scoring for state Special Education Determinations by the U.S. Department of Education.
- Research supports high expectations of students with disabilities leads to increased graduation rates and improved post-school outcomes.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 70% by 2025-2026 will require 2,364 more students with disabilities to graduate by standard requirements.
- Ohio's Each Child Means Each Child, combined with the Whole Child Framework and Strategic Plan encourage and support more students with disabilities graduating with a regular high school diploma.
- The department will support Ohio's educators and administrators understanding of the new graduation pathways, work based learning, and other rigorous options for students with disabilities to meet standard graduation requirements.
- Efforts to catch students at-risk for drop out early, with warning systems starting in fifth grade, should help more students graduate with a regular diploma.
- Higher targets support higher expectations and prioritize efforts to provide all students a rigorous, standards-based education with supports needed to be successful.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	12,060
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	5,065
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	44
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,437

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
12,060	20,606	47.99%	60.00%	58.53%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

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

Ohio's students in the classes of 2018, 2019 and 2020 had multiple pathways to earn a high school diploma:

- 1) Complete core curriculum requirements and earn a state minimum of 20 credits in specific subjects. Additionally, they must receive instruction in economics and financial literacy and complete at least two semesters of fine arts. AND
- 2) Demonstrate what they have learned through one of the following demonstration pathways:
 - a) Ohio's State Tests - Earn 18 out of 35 points on seven end-of-course state tests. Up to five points can be earned on each test. A minimum of four points in math, four points in English language arts, and six points across science and social studies is required.
 - b) Industry-recognized credential and score on workforce readiness test - Earn an industry-recognized credential or a group of credentials totaling 12 points and earn the required score on the WorkKeys test.
 - c) College and career readiness tests - Earn remediation-free scores in math and English language arts on the ACT or SAT.

If none of the demonstration pathways were met, two additional options for graduation were available to the class of 2020:

Option 1 - Students must take and pass courses that constitute the core curriculum requirements and take all seven end-of-course exams. If the student receives a score of "1" or "2" on any math or English language arts test, the student must retake the test at least once. Additionally, the student must meet two of the following:

- Earn a GPA of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale in all courses completed during the 11th and 12th grade (must complete at least four full-year, or equivalent, courses);
- Complete a capstone project during 12th grade that the district or school defines;
- During 12th grade, complete a work or community service experience totaling 120 hours that the district or school defines;
- Earn three or more College Credit Plus credits at any time during high school;
- Earn credit for an Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) course and earn an AP exam score of 3 or higher or IB exam score of 4 or higher at any time during high school;
- Earn a WorkKeys exam score of 3 on each of three test sections;
- Earn a State Board-approved industry-recognized credential or credentials that equal at least three points;
- Meet OhioMeansJobs Readiness Seal requirements.

Option 2 - Students must take and pass courses that constitute the core curriculum requirements and take all seven end-of-course exams. Students must finish a career-technical program that includes at least four courses in a single career pathway and complete at least one of the options below:

- Earn a total score of Proficient or better based on all career-technical exams or test modules;
- Earn an industry-recognized credential or credentials that equal 12 points;
- Complete a workplace experience totaling 250 hours with evidence of positive evaluations.

For more information on Ohio's graduation requirements for the class of 2020, see <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Ohio-s-Graduation-Requirements/Earning-an-Ohio-High-School-Diploma-for-the-CI-1>

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

YES

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not confirm it is reporting its baseline using section 618 exiting data.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	21.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	21.80%	21.70%	21.60%	21.50%	21.50%
Data	24.12%	20.26%	20.89%	20.63%	20.68%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	16.68%	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special->

Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialedtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 2 Target Rationale

- Reaching 13% by the 2025-2026 school year would move Ohio from the lowest-performing group of states to the highest-performing group of states in the annual ranking and scoring for state Special Education Determinations by the U.S. Department of Education.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 13% by 2025-2026 will require 758 fewer students with disabilities across Ohio to drop out of high school.
- The urgency of decreasing the dropout rate for students with disabilities is essential to increasing life-long success and positive outcomes for adulthood.
- Rigorous targets reflect high expectations to encourage change and strengthen supports.
- Greater accountability and expectations for dropout prevention are needed. The alternate pathways to graduation could help as well as increased mental health supports in our schools.
- Implementation of Early Warning Systems should help districts identify and support youth before they consider dropping out of high school. We must continue to lower the dropout rate to as close to zero as possible.
- We must continue to find ways to change the adult behaviors to keep our students in school and help them reach graduation.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	12,060
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	5,065

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	44
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,437

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,437	20,606	20.68%	16.68%	16.68%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Local education agencies are required to report a "withdrawal reason" code each time a student changes their relationship with the LEA. The most recent withdrawal code for each student determines their exiting reason. The withdrawal reason codes that translate to dropout status in the EdFacts exiting report (C009) are:

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	85.20%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	81.88%	85.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	83.46%	85.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	84.20%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	80.92%	85.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	81.52%	85.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 3a Math Target Rationale

- For grade 4, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 5.8% in 2021-2022, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- For grade 8, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 4.08% in 2021-2022, by 5% in 2022-2023, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- For high school, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 3.48% in 2021-2022, by 5% in 2022-2023, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to participate in statewide math assessments:
 - o 754 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 671 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 608 more high school children with disabilities.

Indicator 3a Reading Target Rationale

- For grade 4, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 4.8% in 2021-2022, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- For grade 8, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 3.12% in 2021-2022, by 5% in 2022-2023, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- For high school, the 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021), then increase by 1.4% in 2021-2022, by 5% in 2022-2023, and by 2% each year through 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to participate in statewide reading assessments:
 - o 695 more grade 4 children with disabilities;

- o 629 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
- o 517 more high school children with disabilities.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,295	20,599	21,278
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5,909	5,230	6,066
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	11,510	11,714	11,177
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,514	1,647	2,131

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,270	20,667	20,015
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5,937	5,348	5,430
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	11,382	11,569	10,219
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,510	1,654	2,085

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,933	20,295		85.20%	93.29%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	18,591	20,599		81.88%	90.25%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	19,374	21,278		83.46%	91.05%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,829	20,270		84.20%	92.89%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	18,571	20,667		80.92%	89.86%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	17,734	20,015		81.52%	88.60%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at:

<https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview>

(Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results, but the link is inactive.

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	21.86%	22.86%	24.86%	27.86%	31.86%	36.86%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.97%	11.97%	13.97%	16.97%	20.97%	25.97%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	17.84%	18.84%	20.84%	23.84%	27.84%	32.84%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	26.83%	27.83%	29.83%	32.83%	36.83%	41.83%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	13.94%	14.94%	16.94%	19.94%	23.94%	28.94%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	6.77%	7.77%	9.77%	12.77%	16.77%	21.77%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the

proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE’s newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio’s state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 3b Math Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for indicator 3b reflect increasing increments of growth from the prior year through 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio’s 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient in standard statewide math assessments:
 - o 2,598 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 2,537 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 2,348 more high school children with disabilities.

Indicator 3b Reading Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for indicator 3b reflect increasing increments of growth from the prior year through 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio’s 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient in standard statewide reading assessments:
 - o 2,614 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 2,542 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 2,586 more high school children with disabilities.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17,419	16,944	17,243
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no	1,383	546	1,012

accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,424	1,313	2,065

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17,319	16,917	15,649
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,725	710	332
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,922	1,649	727

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,807	17,419		21.86%	21.86%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,859	16,944		10.97%	10.97%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,077	17,243		17.84%	17.84%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,647	17,319		26.83%	26.83%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2,359	16,917		13.94%	13.94%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,059	15,649		6.77%	6.77%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at:

<https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview>

(Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results, but the link is inactive.

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	51.72%	52.72%	53.72%	54.72%	55.72%	56.72%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	42.44%	43.44%	44.44%	45.44%	46.44%	47.44%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	45.61%	46.61%	47.61%	48.61%	49.61%	50.61%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	30.60%	31.60%	32.60%	33.60%	34.60%	35.60%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	35.67%	36.67%	37.67%	38.67%	39.67%	40.67%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	47.39%	48.39%	49.39%	50.39%	51.39%	52.39%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 3c Math Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for Indicator 3c will increase by 1% from the previous year's performance through 2025-2026.
- The release of the Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool will impact the number of students taking alternate assessments. Students no longer eligible for the alternate assessment will transition to the standard assessment.
- Ohio's students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment are starting at a much higher rate of performance than students with disabilities taking the standard assessment, so the increments of growth proposed for indicator 3c are not as high as those proposed for indicator 3b.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient in alternate statewide math assessments:
 - o 76 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 83 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 105 more high school children with disabilities.

Indicator 3c Reading Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for indicator 3c will increase by 1% from the previous year's performance through 2025-2026.
- The release of the Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool will impact the number of students taking alternate assessments. Students no longer eligible for the alternate assessment will transition to the standard assessment.
- Ohio's students with disabilities taking the alternate assessment are starting at a much higher rate of performance than students with disabilities taking the standard assessment, so the increments of growth proposed for indicator 3c are not as high as those proposed for indicator 3b.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient in alternate statewide reading assessments:
 - o 76 more grade 4 children with disabilities;

- o 83 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
- o 107 more high school children with disabilities.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,514	1,647	2,131
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	783	699	972

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,510	1,654	2,085
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	462	590	988

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	783	1,514		51.72%	51.72%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	699	1,647		42.44%	42.44%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	972	2,131		45.61%	45.61%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	462	1,510		30.60%	30.60%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	590	1,654		35.67%	35.67%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	988	2,085		47.39%	47.39%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at:

<https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview>

(Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results, but the link is inactive.

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	34.24	33.24	32.24	31.24	30.24	29.24
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	41.87	40.87	39.87	38.87	37.87	36.87
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	44.65	43.65	42.65	41.65	40.65	39.65
Math	A <=	Grade 4	33.01	32.01	31.01	30.01	29.01	28.01
Math	B <=	Grade 8	39.28	38.28	37.28	36.28	35.28	34.28
Math	C <=	Grade HS	31.91	30.91	29.91	28.91	27.91	26.91

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address

(specialedtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 3d Math Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for indicator 3d will decrease by 1% from the prior year through 2025-2026, resulting in a smaller gap between students with disabilities and all students.
- The ideal scenario for decreasing the gap is for the performance of all students to still improve over time, with the rate of improvement for students with disabilities outpacing that of all students in order to decrease the gap. With this goal in mind, gap targets may be harder to meet, especially with the decline in the 2020-2021 performance of students with disabilities due to interruptions in modes of instruction and services during the pandemic.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient on statewide math assessments, assuming no change in the proficiency rate for all students:
 - o 866 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 846 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 783 more high school children with disabilities.

Indicator 3d Reading Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- The 2020-2021 performance will be the target for the first year (2020-2021). After holding steady for one year, the targets for indicator 3d will decrease by 1% from the prior year through 2025-2026, resulting in a smaller gap between students with disabilities and all students.
- The ideal scenario for decreasing the gap is for the performance of all students to still improve over time, with the rate of improvement for students with disabilities outpacing that of all students in order to decrease the gap. With this goal in mind, gap targets may be harder to meet, especially with the decline in the 2020-2021 performance of students with disabilities due to interruptions in modes of instruction and services during the pandemic.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final targets by 2025-2026 will require the following number of children with disabilities across Ohio to score at or above proficient on statewide reading assessments, assuming no change in the proficiency rate for all students:
 - o 871 more grade 4 children with disabilities;
 - o 848 more grade 8 children with disabilities;
 - o 862 more high school children with disabilities.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	113,283	120,857	127,409
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17,419	16,944	17,243
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	61,061	62,497	77,525
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,482	1,366	2,097
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,383	546	1,012
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,424	1,313	2,065

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	112,306	126,039	115,666
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17,319	16,917	15,649
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	64,217	65,378	43,994
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,984	1,703	742
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,725	710	332
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,922	1,649	727

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.86%	56.09%		34.24	34.24	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	10.97%	52.84%		41.87	41.87	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	17.84%	62.49%		44.65	44.65	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	26.83%	59.84%		33.01	33.01	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	13.94%	53.22%		39.28	39.28	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	6.77%	38.68%		31.91	31.91	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Ohio Department of Education Report Portal provides the public extensive access to assessment results, including student data by demographic characteristics and test types at:

<https://reports.education.ohio.gov/overview>

(Note: users may need to refresh the page as soon as it loads in order for the report options to appear.)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	25.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	1.40%	8.77%	8.47%	8.17%	8.17%
Data	5.21%	8.77%	5.74%	5.57%	25.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	17.50%	15.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 4a Target Rationale

- This option is a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 15% by 2025-2026 will require five fewer districts across Ohio to have a discipline discrepancy of 1% or greater between students with and without disabilities.
- Exclusionary discipline is an access to education issue. This indicator directly affects graduation rates and dropout rates for students with disabilities.
- There are ongoing equity issues in exclusionary discipline practices for students with disabilities. Kids are attached to these numbers, so we need to see a decline in discipline discrepancies over time.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

908

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5	25	25.00%	20.00%	20.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

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

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

A. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures and practices. Areas reviewed by the LEA include:

- 1) The LEA's code of conduct;
- 2) The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
- 3) The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes their learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address their behavior;
- 4) The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removals for students with disabilities;
- 5) The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
- 6) The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

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

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

D. OEC requires that all instances of noncompliance be corrected in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:

- 1) Correct individual student records determined to be noncompliant;
- 2) Revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA; and
- 3) Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements through a review of state-selected student records from a subsequent reporting period.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Although the state identified 6 LEAs with significant discrepancies for Indicator 4A for FFY 2019, the state did not identify noncompliance for these LEAs through the review of policies, procedures, and practices pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b).

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.20%	1.42%	0.53%	1.08%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

914

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	19	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 by race, OEC completes the following process:

A. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities

to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures and practices. Areas reviewed by the LEA include:

- 1) The LEA's code of conduct;
- 2) The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
- 3) The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes their learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address their behavior;
- 4) The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removals for students with disabilities;
- 5) The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
- 6) The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

B. LEAs are required to send the completed self-review report to OEC, along with a sample of records for students with disabilities within the specified racial group 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.00%
A	64.80%	Data	65.13%	65.81%	63.28%	63.72%	64.16%
B	2020	Target <=	10.80%	10.50%	10.20%	10.00%	10.00%
B	11.86%	Data	11.77%	12.41%	11.96%	11.89%	11.90%
C	2020	Target <=	4.10%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
C	3.62%	Data	3.93%	3.63%	3.60%	3.77%	3.74%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	64.80%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target B <=	11.86%	11.80%	11.75%	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%
Target C <=	3.62%	3.60%	3.56%	3.54%	3.53%	3.51%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three

articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 5a Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- Data show that more than 1% of growth per year previously has been attained. The anticipated development and implementation of an integrated model for a statewide multi-tiered system of support may result in more inclusive placements and a less restrictive environment for students with disabilities over time.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 69% by 2025-2026 will require 10,577 more school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.

Indicator 5b Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- With additional strategies and supports in place, 11% should be an appropriate target by 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 11% by 2025-2026 will require 2,163 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

Indicator 5c Target Rationale

- This option represents a middle ground between the two target options originally considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 3.51% by 2025-2026 will require 267 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.
- These targets recognize that separate facilities must be part of a full continuum of placements, while striving for a continued decrease over time in students with disabilities placed in the most restrictive environments.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	251,970
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	163,282
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,892
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	7,393

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	539
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1,179

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	163,282	251,970	64.16%	64.80%	64.80%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,892	251,970	11.90%	11.86%	11.86%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	9,111	251,970	3.74%	3.62%	3.62%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2020 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 5, due to the change in reporting requirements to now include 5-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten with this indicator instead of Indicator 6.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	52.20%	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%
A	Data	67.05%	68.28%	71.36%	73.13%	73.66%
B	Target <=	38.50%	38.40%	38.40%	38.40%	38.40%
B	Data	23.44%	21.80%	18.39%	15.94%	16.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative

listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 6a Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- This approach keeps the 2021-2022 target closer to the 2020-2021 data in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic, then shows ambitious improvement each year to get Ohio to 80% by 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 80% by 2025-2026 will require 2,507 more preschool children across Ohio to attend regular early childhood programs.
- The state's improvement strategies and initiatives impacting this indicator put Ohio in position to meet these targets.

Indicator 6b Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- This approach keeps the 2021-2022 target closer to the 2020-2021 data in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic, then shows ambitious improvement each year to get Ohio to 10% by 2025-2026.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 10% by 2025-2026 will require 1,699 preschool children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.
- The state's improvement strategies and initiatives impacting this indicator put Ohio in position to meet these targets.

Indicator 6c Target Rationale

- This approach keeps the 2021-2022 target at baseline in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic and the change in measurement, then shows steady improvement to get Ohio back to, and exceeding, the previous 2019-2020 rate at 1.55%.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 1.55% by 2025-2026 will require 271 preschool children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	66.81%	67.00%	70.00%	73.00%	76.00%	80.00%
Target B <=	18.94%	18.00%	16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	2.98%	2.98%	2.50%	2.20%	1.80%	1.55%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	5,445	9,294	4,268	19,007
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,406	6,346	2,947	12,699
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,026	1,493	692	3,211
b2. Number of children attending separate school	105	189	90	384
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	3	1	5
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	231	246	89	566

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	12,699	19,007	73.66%	66.81%	66.81%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,600	19,007	16.20%	18.94%	18.94%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	566	19,007		2.98%	2.98%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2020 data represent a new baseline for Indicator 6, due to the change in reporting requirements to now include 5-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten with Indicator 5 instead of Indicator 6.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for indicator 6A and 6B, and established the baseline for indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	79.80%	80.20%	80.60%	81.00%	81.00%
A1	64.70%	Data	83.09%	83.62%	82.64%	82.46%	81.79%
A2	2008	Target >=	50.20%	50.80%	51.40%	52.00%	52.00%

A2	47.40%	Data	49.19%	50.17%	49.70%	52.69%	50.91%
B1	2008	Target >=	80.00%	80.40%	80.80%	81.20%	81.20%
B1	65.90%	Data	81.87%	82.59%	81.60%	81.90%	80.82%
B2	2008	Target >=	49.50%	50.10%	50.70%	51.30%	51.30%
B2	45.70%	Data	47.61%	48.27%	47.73%	51.40%	48.46%
C1	2008	Target >=	82.10%	82.50%	82.90%	83.30%	83.30%
C1	66.90%	Data	82.16%	85.41%	85.42%	84.78%	83.21%
C2	2008	Target >=	60.40%	61.10%	61.80%	62.50%	62.50%
C2	59.20%	Data	66.57%	60.34%	61.13%	63.05%	59.80%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	81.90%	82.20%	82.50%	82.85%	83.25%	83.70%
Target A2 >=	50.91%	50.91%	50.91%	51.00%	51.20%	51.40%
Target B1 >=	80.91%	81.20%	81.50%	81.85%	82.25%	82.70%
Target B2 >=	48.53%	48.73%	48.93%	49.20%	49.50%	49.80%
Target C1 >=	83.31%	83.60%	83.90%	84.25%	84.65%	85.10%
Target C2 >=	59.90%	60.10%	60.30%	60.55%	60.85%	61.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement

(indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 7a1 Target Rationale

- Per stakeholder request, this approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 83.7% by 2025-26 will require 132 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills.
- The rigor of these targets recognizes the importance of this area in the development of young children.

Indicator 7a2 Target Rationale

- Ohio's previous targets for 7a2 were rigorous but not attainable. Over six years, Ohio only met the target for one year.
- The pandemic continues to impact these data and gradual recovery over time is anticipated.
- Performance on 7a2 has hovered right around and mostly below 50% for the previous six years.
- Targets for 2020-21 through 2022-23 reflect the 2019-20 performance then increase by approximately 0.10% in 2023-24 and 0.20% in 2024-25 and 2025-26.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 51.4% by 2025-26 will require 39 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in positive social-emotional skills.
- All 2025-26 targets for indicator 7a reflect improvement over baseline (2008-09) and 2019-20 performance.

Indicator 7b1 Target Rationale

- Per stakeholder request, this approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 82.7% by 2025-26 will require 131 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.
- These targets allow for a more gradual increase, while also representing more rigorous targets over time.

Indicator 7b2 Target Rationale

- Per stakeholder request, this approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 49.8% by 2025-26 will require 105 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.
- This approach is appropriately rigorous while still reflecting the needs of preschoolers with disabilities.

Indicator 7c1 Target Rationale

- Per stakeholder request, this approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 85.1% by 2025-26 will require 123 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
- This approach is appropriately rigorous while still reflecting the needs of preschoolers with disabilities.

Indicator 7c2 Target Rationale

- Per stakeholder request, this approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 61.15% by 2025-26 will require 106 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
- This approach is appropriately rigorous while still reflecting the needs of preschoolers with disabilities. Stakeholders recognize the importance of the foundational skills for preschool children measured by this part of the indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

8,244

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	56	0.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,364	16.80%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,710	33.38%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,018	37.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	970	11.95%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,728	7,148	81.79%	81.90%	80.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,988	8,118	50.91%	50.91%	49.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	60	0.74%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,417	17.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,812	34.60%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,013	37.08%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	824	10.14%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,825	7,302	80.82%	80.91%	79.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,837	8,126	48.46%	48.53%	47.22%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	56	0.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,200	14.81%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,187	26.99%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,391	41.85%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,269	15.66%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,578	6,834	83.21%	83.31%	81.62%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,660	8,103	59.80%	59.90%	57.51%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
A2	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
B1	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
B2	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
C1	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.
C2	While preschool enrollment continues to improve, many parents still elect to either keep their children home during COVID-19 case increases or disenroll their children due to overall safety concerns regarding COVID-19. LEAs are reporting significant delays in development and social-emotional skills due to ongoing pandemic related issues, including program closures and inconsistent student attendance.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 8 Target Rationale

- This approach represents a middle ground between the two original target options considered by stakeholders.
- These targets hold yearly growth at 1% until 2023-2024, and then increase yearly growth to 2% for 2024-2025 and for the final target in 2025-2026. This allows the improvement strategies to be more established and support more year-to-year growth, as the Each Child Means Each Child Plan and the 11 District Plan were both introduced very recently in 2021.
- Districts were required to develop new methods of communication with parents during the pandemic, and it is expected these new methods and innovations in parent communication will continue and likely improve reported parental involvement. For example, both teachers and parents have become more comfortable with communicative technology such as virtual meetings, and stakeholders reported that teachers and other educators in their districts have become more comfortable in having less formal communication channels with parents and families, such as sending text messages.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2020-2021 performance, meeting the final target of 91% by 2025-2026 will require 538 more parents to report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	83.63%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%	94.00%
Data	96.05%	95.32%	90.23%	90.98%	83.63%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	83.43%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6,340	7,610	83.63%	83.43%	83.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

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

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

44,832

Percentage of respondent parents

16.97%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	14.40%	16.97%

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

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

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

The presence of systematic nonresponse bias in the survey results is possible, therefore the findings may not be generalizable to all parents of children with disabilities throughout the state. However, the effect is likely minimal, as an informal review conducted by the OSU team indicate that significant improvements in the survey response rate and in number of parents/guardians who participated were achieved in the 2020 administration. This is born out by review of the comparison of demographic characteristics of survey participants to the population of parents/guardians of children with disabilities across the state. While dramatic increases have been achieved in participation in comparison to the state's previously survey and process, the new survey process did not produce a representative sample from which to draw conclusions. Different strategies are being explored to increase the validity of survey results, including weighting responses based on population characteristics.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

The analysis conducted by the Ohio State team revealed overrepresentation of students with disabilities who are American Indian/Alaskan native (6.8% of the respondents versus 0.1% in the total enrollment) and underrepresentation of parents of students with disabilities who are Black (10.8% of the respondents versus 16.8% in the total enrollment). However, the analysis also revealed a higher rate of parents of students with disabilities who are Multiracial than total school enrollment would suggest (6.7% of the respondents versus 5.4% in the total enrollment), so it is plausible that some respondents who selected the multiracial category also identified as Black.

Similar discrepancies were evident in the disability type analysis. Overrepresentation was found in the Autism (15.9% of the respondents versus 10.0% in the total enrollment) and Developmental Delay (12.0% of the respondents versus 2.5% in the total enrollment) categories. Underrepresentation was found in the Specific Learning Disabilities (18.8% of the respondents versus 36.3% in the total enrollment) and Other Health Impaired (9.3% of the respondents versus 17.3% in the total enrollment) categories.

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

NO

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

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

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

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

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

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

The survey was distributed to all parents of students with IEPs within the district. These data provide evidence of the perspectives of a large group of parents of students with disabilities. The team designed a data collection effort intended to result in higher rates of participation and more representation of African American perspectives and points of view of parents/guardians of children with the full range of disability types. The team evenly distributed the 318 school districts that have a high African American student population across cohorts (i.e., at least 16.8 percent, which is the percent of African American student enrollment across the state of Ohio). Next, all other districts were randomly assigned to one of six cohorts. All LEAS will be surveyed once over each six-year cycle.

The survey was distributed to all parents who meet eligibility requirements. The question reflecting the extent to which respondents believe that their child's school works with them to best meet their child's needs was scored on a 1 – 10 scale where 1 represented "not at all" and 10 represented "a great deal." For this report, scores of 7, 8, 9 or 10 were considered an indication that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Analysis performed on respondent data indicates a very high completion rate of participants, with 99% of respondents answering the final survey question used to provide results for Indicator 8.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

This information is provided under the applicable section of this indicator.

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.48%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.83%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

98

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
9	4	834	0.83%	0%	0.48%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Though Ohio's FFY 2019 Indicator 9 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 9 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the seven districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Though Ohio's FFY 2019 Indicator 9 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 9 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the seven districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2019; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	5.92%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%	0.95%	8.24%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

189

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
86	44	743	8.24%	0%	5.92%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

1) Disproportionate representation of students in racial or ethnic groups is determined using risk ratios. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that students in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that students in all other racial groups will be identified. The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students from a specific racial group identified in a specific disability category divided by the percentage of students of all other races identified in that disability category. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Though Ohio's FFY 2019 Indicator 10 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 10 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the 62 districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Though Ohio's FFY 2019 Indicator 10 data reflected less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) did not identify noncompliance for Indicator 10 in FFY 2019 because the department did not have access to FFY 2019 (2019-2020) data until FFY 2020 (2020-2021). Thus, OEC did not identify the districts in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the 62 districts of noncompliance until FFY 2020. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2021 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2019; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.06%	99.40%	98.79%	99.30%	98.51%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
23,521	23,342	98.51%	100%	99.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

179

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

See attachment "Ind 11 - Late Table"

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

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

Data for FFY 2020 represent the year-end 2020-2021 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

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

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	91.45%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.02%	97.99%	99.49%	91.45%	98.01%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,392
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,039

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,634
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	120
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	527
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,634	1,706	98.01%	100%	95.78%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The COVID-19 pandemic closed LEAs in March 2020 and many LEAs lost the ability to conduct in person evaluations for children while virtual guidelines were being established. While LEAs were provided guidance for proceeding with transition practices virtually, there were higher instances when these evaluations did not occur on time, continuing into the 2020-2021 school year. Additionally, many parents of children that were scheduled to transition to preschool special education services either disenrolled their children for health and safety concerns or decided not to have their children receive services during the school building closure period.

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

72

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

See Attachment Ind 12 Late Table

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

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

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	99.50%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.27%	99.96%	99.90%	99.94%	99.91%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
53,317	53,343	99.91%	100%	99.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

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

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

If no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

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

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	34.90%	34.90%	35.00%	39.70%	39.70%
A	39.60%	Data	36.45%	28.81%	27.53%	27.57%	29.68%
B	2009	Target >=	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	75.00%
B	62.70%	Data	76.61%	67.49%	70.86%	64.52%	79.01%
C	2009	Target >=	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	84.00%
C	66.60%	Data	83.95%	83.44%	79.49%	84.74%	86.35%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	29.68%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	39.65%
Target B >=	79.01%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
Target C >=	86.35%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio’s state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state’s performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE’s special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address

(specialedtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 14a Target Rationale

- With the strategies, initiatives and legislation currently in place, the Ohio Department of Education expects consistent growth over the course of the upcoming target years.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 39.65% by 2025-26 will require 105 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- Enrollment in higher education is but one way to measure success for students after high school.
- As students and businesses start to de-emphasize two- and four-year universities and colleges as the 'preferred' pathway to careers and employment, stakeholders believe these targets are more in line with the national trend of post-school education and engagement.
- This approach has Ohio moving in the right direction but also allows time to recover from the impact of the ongoing pandemic.

Indicator 14b Target Rationale

- With the strategies, initiatives and legislation currently in place, the Ohio Department of Education expects consistent growth over the course of the upcoming target years.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 84% by 2025-26 will require 63 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or be competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- Without knowing more about how the pandemic and COVID restrictions have impacted students with disabilities' employment engagement as defined by 14b (20+ hours per week), stakeholders believe this approach is rigorous yet attainable.

Indicator 14c Rationale

- With the strategies, initiatives and legislation currently in place, the Ohio Department of Education expects consistent growth over the course of the upcoming target years.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 91% by 2025-26 will require 49 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program or be competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.
- This approach will keep Ohio's total post-school engagement ahead of the median average of all states and continue annual growth of 1% each year of the proposed timeline.
- Given the impact of the ongoing impact, 91% is a rigorous end target and the upward trend of a percentage point improvement per year makes sense.
- To account for the often-limited number of follow-up participants and smaller sample size, this approach is an appropriate reflection of how post-school outcomes are measured.

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,450
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	854
Response Rate	58.90%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	202
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	455
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)	12
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).	41

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	202	854	29.68%	29.68%	23.65%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	657	854	79.01%	79.01%	76.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	710	854	86.35%	86.35%	83.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Slippage can be attributed to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on teaching and learning, and transition and post-school services provided by educational and human services agencies. On March 12th, Ohio schools were required to close school buildings for in-person learning and provide alternative means of instruction for students. The building closure order continued through the remainder of the school year. These changes impacted the provision of services that increase the likelihood of transition to post-secondary education for sample exiters. Although teaching and learning continued, it is probable that opportunities for authentic career and college preparatory experiences, which help youth access post-secondary education were limited. The slippage with engagement in postsecondary education is consistent with the declining undergraduate enrollment rates for 2 and 4-year institutions, reported nationally.
B	Slippage can also be attributed to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on teaching and learning, transition and post-school services provided by educational and human services agencies, and employment. The closure of many non-essential businesses for in-person operations began on March 15, 2020 and a stay-at-home order was in place across Ohio from March 23rd through May 31st. These changes impacted the provision of services that increase the likelihood of transition to post-secondary education and paid employment prior to exiting school for sample exiters. Although, employment opportunities may have increased as the stay-at-home order lifted, exiters may have chosen not to work for health and safety reasons. Furthermore, the pandemic exacerbated the direct support professional and employment specialist shortage and likely contributed to challenges for exiters interested in working but requiring assistance with finding and maintaining employment.
C	Slippage can be attributed to the lower number of exiters who reported participating in some other postsecondary education or training program or some other employment. The lower engagement rates for these two categories (i.e., 3 & 4) are likely due to the closure of businesses, schools, and other training programs due to health and safety concerns.

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.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	52.50%	58.90%

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

There are several strategies that will be implemented to increase response rates. During the professional development provided to district representatives for Indicator 14 data collection and reporting, we will encourage participants to schedule the follow-up interview at the time of the exit interview and secure additional exiter contact information. We will also recommend the use of a pre-notification strategy in which a post-card or email is sent to the exiter that reminds the individual of an upcoming interview. We will also suggest to district representatives the importance of communicating to exiters that their responses are confidential and will be aggregated with responses of other exiters from across the state. Lastly, during the professional development for district representatives, we will stress the importance of having exiters respond to the survey item that serves as the basis for indicator 14 data analysis and reporting.

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

Proportion tests were used to determine if the characteristics of the survey respondents are the same as those of all exiters in Ohio who had an IEP and left the high school in the year of 2019-2020. In other words, the representativeness of the sample data was analyzed on the demographic variables of gender, ethnicity, disability type, and limited English proficiency. Significant results would indicate the survey respondents were different from the population of exiters targeted by the OLTS study; therefore, non-response biases may exist, and the findings of the study may not be generalizable to the population of exiters in the state in 2019-2020. As a result, caution is warranted when interpreting the findings. The results of the analysis show there was a significantly higher percentage of white (non-Hispanic) exiters, but significantly lower percentages of Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American and multiracial exiters in the survey respondents in 2019-2020. This indicates that relatively fewer individuals in the Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American and multiracial groups responded and provided complete data to the OLTS exit and follow-up surveys; there were relatively more white (non-Hispanic) exiters in the sample, compared to the state population of exiters in 2019-2020.

We will implement several strategies to reduce bias in response rates. First, when providing professional development to district representatives responsible for conducting interviews with exiters, we will communicate the importance of collecting multiple forms of contact for exiters. For exiters who are underrepresented in our data collection and reporting, we will advise district representatives to schedule a follow-up call during the students' interviews when study exit data is collected. We will also recommend the use of a pre-notification strategy in which a post-card or email is sent to the contacts provided by the exiter of an upcoming interview. We will also advise districts who have more than 30 students with IEPs and use the roster method to survey a representative sample of their exiters, that they should oversample exiters who identify as Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American, or multi-racial.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The analysis performed by the Kent State team showed only chance variations across gender. However, the analysis revealed overrepresentation of students with disabilities who are white (80.7% of the OLTS sample versus 66.5% in the total exiters); underrepresentation of students with disabilities who are Hispanic/Latino (2.4% of the OLTS sample versus 6.1% in the total exiters), black or African-American (14.2% of the OLTS sample versus 20.4% in the total exiters), or multiracial (2.4% of the OLTS sample versus 5.8% in the total exiters); overrepresentation of students with intellectual disability (12.2% of the OLTS sample versus 7.6% in the total exiters) or specific learning disability (49.4% of the OLTS sample versus 39.6% in the total exiters); and underrepresentation of students with speech and language impairment (0.8% of the OLTS sample versus 10.3% in the total exiters).

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

NO

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sampling Element

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

Sampling Unit

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

Sampling Frame

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

Sampling Categories

Ohio's 246,560 children and youth with disabilities (as of 2005-2006) receive IDEA Part B special education services through the following operationally defined categories:

Category 1 Traditional Local Education Agencies – ODE recognized 611 districts as Traditional Local Education Agencies during 2005-2006. This category serviced 220,051 students with disabilities, constituting 89% of all special education students served.

Category 2 Community Schools – ODE recognized 216 districts as community schools during 2005-2006. The term "community schools" is synonymous with "charter schools" in Ohio. This category serviced 7,917 students with disabilities, constituting 3% of all special education students served.

Category 3 Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City Schools – OSEP requires annual sampling of all LEAs with average daily memberships (ADM) exceeding 50,000. Both the Cleveland Municipal City and Columbus City Schools met this requirement in 2005-2006 but currently do not. This category serviced 18,221 students with disabilities, constituting 7% of all special education students served.

Category 4 State Supported Schools – This category includes the Ohio State School for the Blind, the Ohio School for the Deaf, and the Department of Youth Services (i.e., corrections).

This category serviced 371 students with disabilities, constituting <1% of all special education students served.

Sample Size

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

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

Data Collection Procedures

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

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

This information is provided under the applicable section of this indicator.

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	16
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of

Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 15 Target Rationale

- This is the more rigorous target option considered by stakeholders.
- Percentages historically have been above the baseline except the two most recent years.
- The targets increase by 8% each year from the 2019-2020 performance to end above the 43.04% baseline. The increase reflects an anticipated return to pre-pandemic numbers.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 48% by 2025-2026 will require 14 more resolution sessions to be resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	50.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	39.00%-47.00%	40.00%-48.00%	41.00% - 49.00%	42.00% - 50.00%	42.00%-51.00%
Data	50.00%	41.07%	54.17%	36.07%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	8.00%	16.00%	24.00%	32.00%	40.00%	48.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	16	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	123
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	33
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	62

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtargets@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism

and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

Indicator 16 Target Rationale

- Historically, more than 72% of mediations result in agreements, with more than 80% of mediations resulting in mediation agreements in the two most recent years.
- The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in many challenges, including virtual mediations.
- The targets for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 allow the state to maintain the 2019-2020 performance while recovering from the impact of the pandemic.
- The targets will increase by 1% each to year to end above the 83.5% baseline.
- In comparison to Ohio's 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target range of 84%-88% will require 4 more mediations to result in mediation agreements.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.50%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	74.00%-82.00%	75.00%-83.00%	76.00% - 84.00%	77.00% - 85.00%	77.00%-85.00%
Data	75.84%	76.32%	79.56%	81.76%	80.00%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	77.00%	85.00%	77.00%	85.00%	78.00%	86.00%	79.00%	87.00%	80.00%	88.00%	84.00%	88.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
33	62	123	80.00%	77.00%	85.00%	77.24%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Over the past five years, the Ohio Department of Education and various stakeholders have been developing, implementing and evaluating the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Early Literacy Pilot. As part of Phase I, conducted in 2014-2015, Department staff and stakeholders reviewed several years of data for children ages 3 to 21 who have disabilities. The state-level data revealed a gap between targets and performance that was largest for state reading assessments. Citing research and additional data sources, such as Ohio's current legislated priorities and input from stakeholders about existing infrastructure, Department staff and stakeholders chose to take advantage of existing resources for improving early literacy outcomes for all children in preschool through grade 3, including students with disabilities.

The intent of this results-driven accountability initiative was to measure progress in early literacy outcomes in targeted districts selected for strategic assistance. Ohio's two state-identified measurable results (SiMR) reflect an agencywide focus on early language and literacy development and are based on subsets of measures developed for Ohio's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan.

State-identified measurable result 1 (SiMR 1): The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or higher on Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test.

State-identified measurable result 2 (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.

The Department recognizes the state-approved reading diagnostic used to assess whether students are on track for reading proficiency varies from district to district. It also notes that SiMR 1 includes the results for students who take alternate assessments, and SiMR 2 does not include any student placed on an alternate assessment because such students are excused from the reading diagnostic.

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

NO

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

YES

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

Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot was implemented over five years among two cohorts representing 15 districts and 24 schools. Cohort 1 included 14 schools within eight districts, three of which are urban districts. Cohort 2 included 10 schools within seven districts. Cohort 1 began pilot implementation in 2016-2017 and Cohort 2 began implementation one year later.

Approximately 16.5% of Ohio's kindergarten through grade 3 students are identified as students with disabilities, slightly higher than the national average of 13%. Within the Early Literacy Pilot, 17% of Cohort 1 kindergarten through grade 3 students and 19% of Cohort 2 kindergarten through grade 3 students were identified as having a disability.

During the 2020-2021 implementation year, the Early Literacy Pilot served a total of 482 preschool through grade 3 educators, with 247 of these educators in Cohort 1 and 235 educators in Cohort 2. Cohort 1 consisted of 4,215 preschool through grade 3 students and Cohort 2 served 3,303 students for a total of 7,518 preschool through grade 3 students.

Ohio's goals in addressing Tier 1 instruction for all educators include being able to more readily diagnose why students are struggling with reading and provide evidence-based reading instruction and intervention and lower the number of students being identified as having a disability. Ohio's core team (Department staff from the Office for Exceptional Children, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness, Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, Office of Whole Child Supports, and Office of Data Quality), along with stakeholders (including parents, general and special educators, school leaders and The Region 8 Comprehensive Center), selected targets for each state-identified measurable result designed to gauge progress for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools. It is important to note that analyses are not comparing the same students across years. For example, third grade students in 2015-2016 are not the same students in 2016-2017 or 2017-2018.

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

YES

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

The theory of action for Ohio's original SSIP focused on early literacy has not changed and is available at the first link below. Ohio's next SSIP is focused on graduation, with a new theory of action available at the second link below.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Ohio's original SSIP theory of action (early literacy): <https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Early-Literacy/Ohio-Part-B-SSIP-Phase-III-Year-4-Report.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>
(Appendix A, p.50)

Ohio's new SSIP theory of action (graduation): <https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes/Ohio-SSIP-Theory-of-Action-Each-Child-On-Track-2.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>

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

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The Early Literacy Pilot utilized a rigorous and thorough stakeholder-driven, data-based planning process to establish a comprehensive early literacy system in Ohio. The federal fiscal years 2020-2025 SSIP will expand upon the foundation established in the early grades by pivoting and expanding into high school to ensure students with disabilities are making progress toward graduation and successful post-school outcomes. Based upon this pivot to high school, the Department will be making changes to the SiMR. The systems and data analysis that follow describe the process for this change.

System Analysis

Ohio has existing legislative policies which provide a solid foundation and catalyst for systems change at the high-school level. Legislation also requires secondary transition planning for students with disabilities to begin at age 14. The Department will leverage agency and state-level resources, including an early warning system tool and graduation reporting system when developing the new SSIP. Existing cross-agency and cross-office teaming structures, coupled with a coordinated regional system of support, will allow for effective and efficient local training and coaching to implement the SSIP activities with fidelity.

The Department, in partnership with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center, American Institutes for Research and National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative, conducted the pilot project "On-Time Graduation Project" from 2017- 2019. A cross-office team supported four school districts and four regional state support teams to implement a set of prescribed improvement strategies to increase the number of students with disabilities who graduated on time. The Department plans to scale the "On-Time Graduation Project" and leverage the lessons learned to better improve outcomes for students. The implementation guide, rubric and data collection tools from the project will be adapted for use with the new SSIP.

Data Analysis

Data from the last two years place Ohio within the lowest-performing group of states on graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities. Ohio's percentage of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular high school diploma in 2018-2019 was the second lowest in the nation at 48%, excluding U.S. territories with very small student populations. Given this, the Department has prioritized increasing the percentage of students with a disability graduating with a regular diploma.

Based on the ongoing low performance on state performance plan indicators 1 and 2, the Department intends to change the SiMR for the 2020-2025 SSIP to focus on Indicator 1: the percent of youth with individualized education programs exiting high school with a regular high school diploma. As a result, Ohio will see the following increase in graduation rates in selected districts:

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

During the Department's state performance plan indicator target setting, stakeholders selected the more rigorous of two target options for the graduation rate. This proposed target remains consistent with the indicator baseline of 58.53% for one year to account for potentially inflated rates due to changing graduation requirements, raises to 60% in the second year and increases by two percentage points per year until reaching the final target of 70%.

Coherent Improvement Strategies

The redesigned SiMR reflects the vision of Ohio's strategic plan, Each Child, Our Future (<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/About/EachChildOurFuture/Final-Strategic-Plan-Board-Approved.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>), that each child is challenged, prepared and empowered to become a resilient, lifelong learner who contributes to society. These measures support Ohio's goal to increase the percentage of high school graduates who are enrolled, enlisted or employed one year after graduation and the priority strategy to ensure high school inspires students to identify future success and gives students multiple ways to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for graduation and beyond. The measures also directly impact Each Child Means Each Child's (<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes/EachChildMeansEachChild.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>) focus on improved postsecondary transition and outcomes for students with disabilities and the 11 District Plan's outcome to improve the graduation rate for students with disabilities with regular diploma.

The strands of action from the previous Early Literacy Pilot will be expanded to target high school-level students with disabilities, families, school personnel and other agency partners. Activities within these strands have been developed into a new theory of action (see attachment section of the APR), which includes:

Family Partnerships

Facilitating school personnel to prepare, involve and empower families of secondary transition-age youth with disabilities to engage in the secondary transition planning process and make informed decisions that support their children's successful post-school outcomes.

School Personnel Capacity

Building the capacity of school personnel to implement Ohio's graduation plan, career advising, business advisory council and excessive absenteeism policies, positive behavioral interventions and supports legislation, as well as evidence-based predictors (family engagement, interagency collaboration, career development) and practices (early warning intervention and monitoring system, adolescent literacy and mathematics) for students with disabilities so that each child will have equitable access to the program structures.

Collaborative Structures

Coordinating partnerships with regional state support teams, educational service centers, institutions of higher education, Ohio's Statewide Family Engagement Center, adult agency providers and workforce partners.

Multi-tiered Systems of Support

Creating an early warning tool, progress toward meeting graduation requirement reports and an intervention inventory that includes attendance, academic and behavior at the universal, targeted and intensive levels so that students are accurately identified and supported.

Characteristics of Effective Schools

Promoting the use of the state performance plan, early warning and progress monitoring data within the Ohio Improvement Process to provide students with disabilities equitable access to the services and supports needed to meet their individual needs in the least restrictive environment and ensure students with disabilities are on track to graduate.

Overall, the Department will leverage the foundation created by the Early Literacy Pilot, knowledge and materials from the On-Time Graduation pilot project, along with current state, regional and local teaming structures, policy and initiatives to provide the necessary infrastructure for successful implementation of these improvement strategies.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

YES

Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2015-2016	18.20%

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
B	2015-2016	56.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	33.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%
Target B >=	75.00%					

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Part	(A) Number of students with disabilities scoring proficient or higher on Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test. (B) Number of all kindergarten through third grade students on track for reading proficiency, as measured by state-approved diagnostic reading assessments.	(A) Number of students with disabilities who received a score on Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test. (B) Number of all kindergarten through third grade students assessed on state-approved diagnostic reading assessments.	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	23	131		33.00%	17.56%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	1,689	3,029		75.00%	55.76%	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Due to the shift in SSIP focus for federal fiscal years 2021-2025, the SiMR targets for FFY 2021-2025 in the above table reflect Ohio's next SiMR, which will measure the percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma, in alignment with indicator 1. Slippage for SiMR 1 is not calculated since 2019 data was not consistently reported. Statewide across most grades, reading proficiency rates decreased by about eight percentage points. Analysis of third grade English language arts assessment revealed that Ohio's third grade students learned roughly 20% less on average between November 2020 and April 2021 (between the fall and spring administration of the English language arts exam) as compared to students in prior years. Approximately one-third of the total decline in third grade English language arts achievement is due to a decrease in learning during the 2020-2021 school year. The remaining two-thirds of the decrease in learning took place before the fall 2020 testing window (including, but not limited to, school closures in spring 2020). (Source: <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Research-Evaluation-and-Advanced-Analytics/Data-Insights/Data-Insights-Evidence-of-the-Pandemic%E2%80%99s-Impact-on#Using>) This space will be used to further define the SiMR 1 targets and the cohorts implementing Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot.

Both Ohio's SiMRs were designed to gauge progress for Cohort 1 schools.

Cohort 1 SiMR 1

SiMR 1 Baseline data: 18.2% (26 of 143)
 SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2020 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Data: 31.1% (46 of 148)
 SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Data: N/A
 SiMR 1 FFY 2020 Data: 17.56% (23 of 131)

Cohort 2 SiMR 1

SiMR 1 Baseline data: 34.7% (44 of 127)
 SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2020 Target: 33.0%
 SiMR 1 FFY 2018 Data: 33.0% (33 of 100)
 SiMR 1 FFY 2019 Data: N/A
 SiMR 1 FFY 2020 Data: 24.51% (25 of 102)

Slippage for SiMR 2 is not calculated since 2019 data was not consistently reported. Statewide across most grades, reading proficiency rates decreased by about eight percentage points. Analysis of third grade English language arts assessment revealed that Ohio's third grade students learned roughly 20% less on average between November 2020 and April 2021 (between the fall and spring administration of the English language arts exam) as compared to students in prior years. Approximately one-third of the total decline in third grade English language arts achievement is due to a decrease in learning during the 2020-2021 school year. The remaining two-thirds of the decrease in learning took place before the fall 2020 testing window (including, but not limited to school closures in spring 2020). (Source: <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Research-Evaluation-and-Advanced-Analytics/Data-Insights/Data-Insights-Evidence-of-the-Pandemic%E2%80%99s-Impact-on#Using>)

This space will be used to further define the SiMR 2 targets and cohorts implementing Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot.

Cohort 1 SiMR 2

SiMR 2 Baseline data: 56.3% (1,955 of 3,470)
SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Target: 75.0%
SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Target: 75.0%
SiMR 2 FFY 2020 Target: 75%
SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Data: 56.4% (1,844 of 3,269)
SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Data: N/A
SiMR 2 FFY 2020 Data: 55.76% (1,689 of 3,029)

Cohort 2 SiMR 2

SiMR 2 Baseline data: 62.2% (3,665 of 5,895)
SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Target: 75.0%
SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Target: 75.0%
SiMR 2 FFY 2020 Target: 75.0%
SiMR 2 FFY 2018 Data: 59.2% (1,634 of 2,762)
SiMR 2 FFY 2019 Data: N/A
SiMR 2 FFY 2020 Data: 57.59% (1,502 of 2,608)

The Department utilized state assessment and state-approved diagnostics data to calculate progress on each of the SiMRs. The data source for SiMR 1 was Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test, which is used to determine the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or higher. The data source for SiMR 2 was a state-approved diagnostic reading assessment, which is used to calculate the percentage of all kindergarten through third grade students who are on track for reading proficiency.

Pilot districts report SiMR measures to the state's data system as state assessment data. Due to local school building closures and student quarantine as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and individual or family exposure, the spring Ohio third grade English language arts achievement test may not have been administered to all students in pilot buildings.

Ohio contracted with an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation for the Early Literacy Pilot. The evaluator documented, described and explored the system of supports for language and literacy professional learning through the system dynamics lens during the five-year evaluation. The evaluation plan addressed each strand of the Early Literacy Pilot theory of action: leadership, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), educator capacity, family partnerships and community collaboration. The evaluation plan focused on professional learning, language and literacy coaching, student and teacher outcomes, and literacy-based family and community engagement.

- Data was collected on teacher knowledge, classroom practices, student outcomes, administrative supports, regional early literacy specialist supports, coaching, professional learning and family and community engagement.
 - Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) data was collected to measure teacher knowledge. Voyager Sopris Learning gathered this data through its online learning platform and shared it with the Department and the external evaluators.
 - Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) data was collected to help school leadership teams assess and improve the effectiveness of their Multi-Tiered System of Supports for language and literacy. Regional early literacy specialists and districts coaches oversaw data collection and uploaded it to the data dashboard.
 - Coaching data was collected to measure the intensity and impact of coaching. Regional early literacy specialists and district coaches recorded this data in the data dashboard.
 - Curriculum-based measures, such as AIMSweb or Acadience (formerly DIBELS Next), were used to measure student outcomes. Districts collected curriculum-based measurement data and loaded it into the data dashboard.
 - State assessment data, including the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Reading Diagnostic and Ohio's third grade English language arts assessment, was collected and reported by schools to the Department through the Education Management Information System. As part of the data-sharing agreement, the Department provided these data for participating schools to the external evaluators.
- Memoranda of understanding governing data sharing were in place and signed by the appropriate parties. The external evaluators collected no individually identifiable information. The University of Cincinnati's Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved all data measures, collection procedures and analysis methods. The Department and external evaluators monitor all data for reliability, validity and quality. It has built checks for quality and reliability into the evaluation plan. The Department and external evaluators are cautious when interpreting results until they have standardized data collection processes and gathered more evaluation data. The Department and its evaluators are knowledgeable about methods for improving data quality and will implement these processes when necessary.

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

Ohio's first state-identified measurable result utilized Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement assessment to measure students' reading proficiency. The assessment is administered at the end of each academic year and is not required for students who take Ohio's Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. Scores are scaled on five performance levels, including Limited, Basic, Proficient, Accelerated and Advanced and reported to the state's Education Management Information System. Data are aggregated and analyzed for all students in each cohort. Ohio's second state-identified measurable result utilizes a reading diagnostic assessment to determine students who are on track for reading proficiency. This assessment is required to be administered each school year by Sept. 30 to students in grades 1 through 3 and by Nov. 1 to students in kindergarten. Districts have the option of using the state-developed diagnostic or a vendor-developed assessment on the Department's approved list of diagnostic assessments. Student results are reported to the state's Education Management Information System as on track and not on track. Data are aggregated and analyzed for all students in each cohort.

Ohio's education system should interpret results for SiMR 2 with caution. There may be inconsistencies in reading diagnostic assessments across time as schools select different assessments each year. Additionally, each district using a reading diagnostic can select its own benchmark to measure if a student is on track if that benchmark is above the vendor-recommended cutoff. The state does not track the benchmarks or reading diagnostic selected by districts each year. It is possible that either the benchmark, assessment or both have changed in each district since the start of the pilot.

The Department recognizes the state-approved reading diagnostic used to assess whether students are on track for reading proficiency varies across districts. It also notes that SiMR 1 includes the results for students who take alternate assessments, and SiMR 2 does not include any student placed on an alternate assessment because such students are excused from the reading diagnostic.

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

YES

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

Districts administer Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM) to assess student outcomes and as a proxy for SiMR data that were not collected. These measures are administered to each student up to three times per year (beginning, middle and end of the school year), known as benchmark periods. These measures assess students' basic early literacy skills, including phonemic awareness, basic phonics, oral reading fluency and comprehension.

By the end of the 2020-2021 academic year, the percentages of students at or above benchmark for each measure and grade were as follows:
Cohort 1:

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency = 45%
Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency = 45%
Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency = 45%
Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency = 29%;
Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency = 37%;
Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency = 45%;
Grade 3 Comprehension = 34%.

Cohort 2:

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency = 76%;
Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency = 60%;
Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency = 55%;
Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency = 40%;
Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency = 47%;
Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency = 56%;
Grade 3 Comprehension = 48%.

From the beginning to the end of the 2020-2021 academic year, the following change patterns were observed with respect for students meeting benchmark goals:

Cohort 1 change patterns:

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency: no change (0.9%)
Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency: 2.5% increase
Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency: 5.8% increase (sig. $p < 0.01$)
Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency: no change (0.9%)
Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency: no change (0.7%)
Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency: no change (0.5%)
Grade 3 Reading Comprehension: 3.0% decrease

Cohort 2 change patterns:

Kindergarten Phoneme Segmentation Fluency: 12.3% increase (sig. $p < 0.001$)
Kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency: 5.8% increase (sig. $p < 0.01$)
Grade 1 Nonsense Word Fluency: 15.2% increase (sig. $p < 0.001$)
Grade 1 Oral Reading Fluency: 1.2% increase
Grade 2 Oral Reading Fluency: 2.1% increase
Grade 3 Oral Reading Fluency: 6.3% decrease (sig. $p < 0.001$)
Grade 3 Reading Comprehension: 3.7% decrease

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

NO

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

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Due to local school-building closures and student quarantine as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and individual or family exposure, curriculum-based measurements and the spring Ohio third grade English language arts achievement test may not have been administered to all students in pilot buildings. These closures and quarantine also impacted the way in which classroom observational data and coaching data were collected, as district coaches and regional early literacy specialists conducted observations both in-person and remotely. There was no perceived impact on the validity or reliability for these indicators.

To mitigate the impact of school building closures, remote options were offered to Early Literacy Pilot districts. Schools were provided with the option to administer curriculum-based measurements remotely to students and regional early literacy specialists and district coaches were provided with the option to coach and observe classrooms remotely. Data indicated that most pilot districts participated in remote coaching. A total of 23% of all instructional coaching and 42% of all systems coaching for Cohort 1 was conducted remotely. Cohort 2 utilized remote coaching less, with 5% of instructional coaching and 33% of systems coaching being done remotely.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The evaluation plan for the Early Literacy Pilot can be found on page 11 of Ohio's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan: Phase III Year 3 Report. This report is available at the following link: <https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Special-Education/Early-Literacy/Ohio-Part-B-SSIP-Phase-III-Year-3-Report.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>.

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

NO

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

State Infrastructure:

- State literacy staff: In February 2021, the Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional learning promoted the K-5 literacy specialist to the assistant director of literacy role. This team then hired a new K-5 literacy specialist. Additionally, the team added a dyslexia administrator position. The Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning literacy unit now consists of an assistant director, four literacy specialists (birth-K entry, K-5, 6-8, 9-12), Third Grade Reading Guarantee administrator and dyslexia administrator. The Office for Exceptional Children continues to employ one literacy specialist on the diverse learner team.

Regional Infrastructure:

- Regional Literacy Specialists: The Office for Exceptional Children continues to support the funding of 16 regional early literacy specialists and 11 urban literacy specialists. The Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning funds one full-time and one part-time adolescent literacy specialist, one part-time emergent literacy specialist and two full-time literacy leads. These specialists are housed in state support teams throughout the 16 regions of the state.
- Regional Literacy Networks: Each state support team facilitates at least one literacy network (community of practice or networked improvement community). These networks are used to scale practices from sites receiving intensive support from the state and/or region.

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

Regional support staff, which includes regional early literacy specialists, urban literacy specialists and adolescent specialists, participate in the State Literacy Network. This network provides access to all district and teacher-level professional learning supports and includes monthly literacy sessions to build the state's capacity to serve its districts. In January 2021, the learning shifted to individualize learning by regions. Professional development in identifying problems of practice was provided.

The Department developed a four-year Regional Professional Learning Series in Literacy, described in the 2019 report, which began with the State Literacy Network in September 2018. This series includes more than 100 regional staff from educational service centers and state support teams. These regional teams work with districts and schools to promote evidence-based literacy instruction and effective systems to support implementation. Year one of the professional learning, 2018-2019, focused on building a common disposition and understanding of what it will take to raise literacy achievement throughout the state. The goal of this professional learning series was to guide regional staff in explicitly connecting Department efforts to promote overall school improvement. These efforts include, but are not limited to, professional learning on Integrated Comprehensive Services, the Ohio Improvement Process and implementation science. Years two through four, 2019-2022, focused on evidence-based language and literacy practices. Each evidence-based practice session included resources for instructional support, system implementation, Multi-Tiered System of Supports and data-based decision-making, diverse learners, and home and community connections. This series was led by a team of Department literacy staff, Ohio literacy leads, regional early literacy specialists, adolescent literacy specialists and staff from OCALI.

Regional Literacy Networks are in place in the 16 state support team regions across Ohio. Utilizing the professional learning received in the State Literacy Network meetings, each region began the 2021-2022 school year by identifying one literacy related problem that was common to multiple districts in the region. Participants of the Regional Literacy Networks discuss these problems during their communities of practice meetings. These meetings also provide networking opportunities and directly impact administrators, educators and ultimately the students. This practice will sustain the work of the Early Literacy Pilot and expand the knowledge gained across the state.

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

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Survey data collected from the regional state support teams indicated a need for more in-depth professional learning in creating, facilitating and individualizing a regional literacy network of support. In response to this need, the Department worked with Learning Forward to provide professional development and common planning tools to the regional early literacy specialists. The Department also created a regional literacy network guide to assist in the facilitation of regional literacy networks.

Regional literacy specialists identified meaningful problems of practice for the common planning tool. Criteria for these meaningful problems of practice are as follows:

- Was the problem meaningful, tackling a problem that has sufficient but not overwhelming scope and potentially impacts districts across the state?
- Is the problem solvable? Are the right people and resources engaged such that the problem can be solved in 12-18 months?
- Is the problem relevant, being broad enough to apply to many different systems?

The four categories that emerged were: Multi-tiered Systems of Support with Alignment of Tiers and Grade Levels; Science of Reading: Building Foundations in Districts; Strengthening Organizational Structures; and Communication and Professional Learning and Coaching.

The short-term outcomes include scaled quality networking practices across the regions, as well as support provided to districts not otherwise identified as intensive support districts.

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

Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot was the foundation of Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement, which is directly aligned to the state's strategic plan for education, Each Child, Our Future, and Each Child Means Each Child. The Department used existing structures to continuously refine the Early Literacy Pilot, including Ohio's Learning Standards for English Language Arts, the extended standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, a standards-based system of assessments, data collection systems, accountability systems and report cards, the Ohio Improvement Process, quality preschools, the Third Grade Reading Guarantee, the Dyslexia Pilot Project and a strong system of regional supports. While the 2020-2025 SSIP pivots the state focus to adolescent students, the goal is to continue the foundational aspects of the Early Literacy Pilot throughout the state.

Educational service centers and state support teams are examples of Ohio's strong regional support systems. Ohio's state support teams provide targeted support to districts in their regions on using evidence-based practices to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Included in this support are professional learning opportunities for leadership and all educators, targeted at increasing the achievement of students with disabilities and promoting strong core instruction so fewer students are identified for special education. Collaborating with the Department, the 17 regional early literacy specialists supporting the Early Literacy Pilot districts and two Ohio literacy leads from regional state support team offices have helped develop professional learning opportunities, resources and support systems that promote evidence-based language and literacy practices and interventions. Many nonpilot districts and early childhood education programs, as well as pilot districts have benefited from these resources. Specifically, curriculum-based measurements showed increases from the beginning to the middle of the 2019-2020 school year across all grades and measures for students engaged in the Early Literacy Pilot. An additional resource offered in each region is the Regional Literacy Networks. The regional literacy specialists utilize data to identify common problems across the districts supported and plan for quality networking meetings. These community of practice sessions have been well attended across the state and will sustain the work of the Early Literacy Pilot in addition to replicating the practices in non-pilot districts across the state.

The Department has invested in the professional learning of existing state support team and educational service center staff to better support and strengthen the capacity of local personnel. Department staff members, working with national experts, developed a library of research-based professional learning webinars, recorded presentations and resources as part of Ohio's Literacy Academy, held annually since January 2018. These resources build on the online literacy toolkits (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/Literacy>) to support implementation of evidence-based language and literacy practices.

The state and regional staff that were established through the Early Literacy Pilot and support the state's infrastructure will continue to provide leadership and guidance to districts to improve literacy outcomes for students. Regional professional learning opportunities will continue to provide literacy training and Regional Literacy Networks will offer ongoing support to local districts implementing the requirements on Ohio's Dyslexia legislation. Ohio has received multiple grants since the start of the Early Literacy Pilot to continue the efforts aligned to Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement. These include a \$5 million State Personnel Development Grant, \$35 million Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant, \$42 million Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant and \$1.2 million Model Demonstration for Early Identification of Students with Dyslexia Grant. The Department will incorporate findings and lessons learned across these projects to build the most robust system of literacy supports for all Ohio learners. State leaders will continue to ensure these efforts align with the priorities and objectives of Each Child, Our Future, Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement, Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities and other school improvement efforts. These efforts will continue to expand as the Department annually examines data and identifies targets for improvement.

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

The Department identified evidence-based practices to implement at the district level to improve early language and literacy outcomes for all students in preschool through grade 3, including students with disabilities. The following practices were utilized in each district during the 2020-2021 implementation year:

- Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling for Early Childhood Educators;
- Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling;
- Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum;
- Instructional and systems coaching;
- Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling Applications of Concepts Tool;
- Reading -Tiered Fidelity Inventory;
- Sit Together and Read;
- Partnerships for Literacy.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The primary evidence-based professional learning series selected for Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot was the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS). This series, developed by Voyager Sopris Learning, is based on decades of research on how children learn to read, including the neurobiological basis of reading development. LETRS promotes evidence-based language and literacy instructional practices (Voyager Sopris Learning, Inc., 2016).

The LETRS professional learning series has both an early childhood and a school-age series for educators. LETRS for Early Childhood Educators is divided into four units of study that cover literacy foundations, oral language, phonology, and print knowledge. The school-age LETRS is divided into eight units of study that address topics such as the challenges of learning to read, phonics word recognition, advanced decoding spelling, oral language and vocabulary, reading comprehension, and the reading-writing connection.

The Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum, developed in 2003 by Dr. Michael Heggerty, offers 35 weeks of daily lessons, focusing on eight phonemic awareness skills for preschool through grade 2 students. The curriculum also consists of activities designed to develop letter and sound recognition and language awareness. Lessons are meant to complement existing curriculum and take 10-12 minutes per day.

Coaching is an integral part of the overall Early Literacy Pilot. Instructional coaching promotes the implementation of the evidence-based practices learned in the LETRS modules. Regional early literacy specialists directly support district coaches and, in some cases, classroom teachers on effective implementation of LETRS content. District coaches provide instructional coaching to classroom teachers and support staff. The Department continuously modified support for implementing a coaching system based on the yearly coaching analysis and needs identified by regional early literacy specialists and district coaches.

Regional early literacy specialists supported district coaches as they built capacity for implementing evidence-based language and literacy practices. Systems coaching engaged the principals, district literacy coaches, classroom teachers and intervention specialists in critically examining systems in place to support effective practices. Systems coaching included:

- Assessing the needs, fit and context of new innovations;
- Forming and developing a district leadership team, building leadership team and/or teacher-based teams;
- Conducting a Multi-Tiered System of Supports needs assessment for literacy;
- Supporting fluency in a schoolwide reading model, including:
 - o Evidence-based practices and interventions;
 - o Data interpretation;
 - o Schoolwide reading assessment system;
 - o Schoolwide reading schedule.

District literacy coaches worked closely with regional early literacy specialists to help building administrators and teacher-based teams increase their capacities to use these practices. Ohio modeled a gradual release of responsibility so that by year five, pilot districts will not rely on regional early literacy specialists as their in-house experts. Instead, district coaches and administrators will assume the role of experts. The Department continuously developed coaching supports to meet specific district needs.

While educator knowledge increase was a goal of the professional learning, pilot activities also were designed to assess whether educators used the evidence-based instructional skills for language and literacy in their classrooms. The Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling Application of Concepts (AoC) tools, created by Louisa Moats, Ph.D., Lucy Hart Paulson, Ed.D., and Voyager Sopris Learning, were used to collect classroom implementation data. The LETRS AoC tools contain items that reference language and literacy skills and strategies specific to the face-to-face and online professional learning tools. These tools have two purposes: (1) literacy coaches used the tools as checklists to do instructional coaching with teachers; and (2) regional early literacy specialists collected data on the implementation of newly acquired language and literacy knowledge.

Regional early literacy specialists collected the observation data on a subset of teachers who scored 80% or higher on each LETRS post-test. For data collection, there were two observations for each teacher that were integrated into the ongoing coaching cycle. Voyager Sopris Learning created a series of 10 webinars to train literacy coaches and regional early literacy specialists to use these tools. Cohort 1 began data collection January 2019, and Cohort 2 began in fall 2019. The external evaluation team analyzed and triangulated them with other data sources.

Kim St. Martin, Ph.D., from Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative, trained the regional early literacy specialists to use Tiers 1, 2 and 3 of the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory with building leadership teams (St. Martin, Nantais, Harms, Huth, 2015). This assessment tool was developed in Michigan to support building leadership teams in assessing School-Wide Reading Model implementation. A School-Wide Reading Model includes multi-tiered structures encompassing evidence-based practices for improving reading outcomes for all students. Such a model also includes systems to address the continuum of reading needs across the student body, as well as address data use and analysis. The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory is designed for use in a data-based decision-making process that also looks at student outcome data.

The Department collaborated with the Crane Center for Early Childhood Research and Policy at The Ohio State University to implement Sit Together and Read. This is an empirically tested preschool print-referencing intervention comprised of read-aloud practices and scaffolding strategies to encourage and strengthen children's knowledge and awareness of print (OSU, 2017). The primary focus of Sit Together and Read is to increase communication between teachers and families (Tambyraja, 2019). Sit Together and Read includes two components, one in the classroom and one at home and both typically include 30 books. Teachers and caregivers read one book twice a week with their students using the cards and prompts provided in the program.

Partnerships for Literacy represents a partnership between Ohio's Statewide Family Engagement Center at The Ohio State University and the Department to design and support family and community engagement for early literacy. Partnerships for Literacy offers a systematic approach to family and community engagement that is goal-oriented, sustainable over time and develops the capacity of both educators and family members. Teams of parents and caregivers and school personnel create continuity from school to home for students and families, develop relationships with community partners to support early literacy and systematically embed effective family and community engagement in the Ohio Improvement Process in the school. Ohio's regional family engagement leads provided schools with coaching support to implement family and community engagement practices focused on language and literacy. These regional family engagement leads focused on developing knowledge, skills and perspectives that support meaningful, effective partnership between teachers and families of students with disabilities, English learners and families living in poverty. The Statewide Family Engagement Center led the design and delivery of the professional learning series and was responsible for procuring resources for supporting family and community engagement in early literacy.

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

Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling

Improving student outcomes is directly connected to the knowledge and implementation of quality, standards-aligned instruction that includes tiered intervention and evidence-based practices. As educators received professional development in the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling, their knowledge in the science of reading increased as was demonstrated in the pre- and post-assessment data for each unit. The new understandings of how to focus on specific skills will, over time, impact practice that will lead to systemic change. All learners can benefit from the LETRS content. This directly impacts both the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient on Ohio's third grade English language arts achievement test and the percentage of all kindergarten through grade 3 students receiving an on track proficiency rating as measured by state-approved diagnostic reading assessments.

Heggerty Phonemic Awareness

The Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum focuses on rhyme, syllables, onset-rime, beginning sounds, ending/medial sounds, adding, deleting and substitution of sounds. These are eight critical phonemic awareness skills often not addressed in core curriculums. Supplementing existing curriculums with the Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum provided new practices for teachers to implement and quickly impact student outcomes.

Evidence-based Systems and Instructional Coaching

Data were collected on several evaluation activities including coaching, professional development (teacher knowledge) and systems change. Regional and district coaching that occurred was gathered within coaching logs that capture data on both the systems coaching (implementation of pilot activities within a school) and instructional coaching (supporting implementation of evidence-based early literacy strategies within a classroom) that were part of the Early Literacy Pilot. Coaching logs were broken into either systems or instructional categories. Coaching log data for this year also were categorized into in person or remote. A total of 997 coaching sessions were provided to teachers in Cohort 1 (50% instructional, 50% systems). Of these coaching sessions, 23% of instructional sessions and 42% of systems sessions were facilitated remotely. For Cohort 2, a total of 1,420 coaching sessions were provided to teachers (64% instructional, 36% systems). Of these coaching sessions, 5% of instructional sessions and 33% of systems sessions were facilitated remotely. For 2020-2021, 72% of Cohort 1 teachers and 86% of Cohort 2 teachers received coaching. For coaching session facilitation, district coaches in both Cohorts 1 and 2 independently lead the majority of instructional and systems coaching sessions, which is expected at this point in the Early Literacy Pilot.

Application of Concepts

LETRS Application of Concepts (AoC) is an observational tool created to measure teacher classroom implementation of early language and literacy core instruction. These data were collected by a Regional Early Literacy Specialist. The Application of Concepts measures teacher classroom implementation of early language and literacy core instruction through observed use of specific indicators (measured in specific sections). The regional early literacy specialists complete at least one section of the tool two times on the same teacher to measure improvement over time.

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory

The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory guides building leadership teams as they examine building-level language and literacy Multi-Tiered System of Supports, including analyzing and using data for instructional planning. The inventory also examines Tier 2 and 3 instructional supports on top of Tier 1 core instructional practices. The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory helps schools gauge their School-Wide Reading Model features for all three tiers to prioritize or develop their Multi-Tiered System of Supports for language and literacy, initially focusing goals on the lowest-scoring elements of Tier 1. The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory measures three tiers and 12 subscales; every item is scored as 0 (not in place), 1 (partially in place) or 2 (fully in place) and helps teams prioritize next steps to improving their Multi-Tiered System of Supports. The overall tier and each subscale can have a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of two times the total number of relevant items. For example, Tier 1 has 27 items, so the total score will not exceed 54. Higher scores denote better implementation of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports. Average scores for each subscale and all of Tier 1 are reported here as percentages. Right now, the recommendation is a total and tier score of 80% to indicate implementation with fidelity.

Systems change was measured via the Reading-Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI). The R-TFI measured the extent to which school leadership teams used evidence-based practices to improve literacy (specifically student reading), determine the existence and effectiveness of a support system for a diverse group of readers and examine the collection and use of data to inform literacy activities. R-TFI findings demonstrated improvement and progress toward having systems in place to support schoolwide language and literacy core instruction and reading intervention. For Cohort 1, the Tier 1 Overall score was approaching the 80% target. For Cohort 2, the Tier 1 Overall score exceeded the 80% target. For both cohorts, Tiers 2 and 3 Overall scores approached the 80% target. For both cohorts, Evaluation supports across all three tiers showed the greatest area of need, suggesting that schools should continue to focus their efforts on assistance with monitoring the progress of the schoolwide reading plan and progress monitoring student performance across all three tiers of instruction.

Sit Together and Read

The school-building closures and quarantine protocols due to the COVID 19 pandemic transformed the implementation of the Sit Together and Read program as one of the family engagement components implemented in the Early Literacy Pilot. Districts that participated during the 2020-2021 implementation year utilized both live and video recordings of teachers presenting the books and the print concepts outlined in the program. These videos provided both access to students who were unable to be in the classroom and enhanced the at-home portion of this program by allowing repeated viewings.

Partnerships for Literacy

Partnerships for Literacy first was implemented in year 3 of the pilot to allow educators time to complete the intensive, two-year LETRS professional learning series before introducing additional pilot activities. Cohort 1 family engagement leads began implementing Partnerships for Literacy in the 2018-

2019 school year; Cohort 2 began in the fall 2019.

The intended result is improved home and school supports and resources for language and literacy development for young students through the following:

- The implementation of a locally developed plan based on current practices and priorities, aligned with the school's focused plan and linked to community resources;
- A sustainable, representative, family-teacher team linked to the school's building leadership team and focusing on the needs of all families through family and community engagement practices;
- Teachers who practice more effective family engagement; and
- Teams that develop and expand links with community resources to address the identified needs of families and support literacy at home, at school and in community settings.

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

The state collected both systems and individual implementation data to check for fidelity of implementation. Systems data came from the Reading-Tiered Fidelity Inventory that was completed by local teams and measured the extent to which school leadership teams used data in their continuous improvement process to analyze the implantation of evidence-based practices to improve literacy, determine the existence and effectiveness of a support system for a diverse group of readers and examine the collection and use of data to inform literacy activities.

Individual data came from the Application of Concepts (AoC) and coaching log data. These data were collected by coaches and regional early literacy specialists. The AoC measured teacher implementation of early language and literacy core instruction as observers indicated whether a specific indicator (measured in specific sections) was present during the classroom observation (six sections for K-3 AoC and four for early childhood AoC). The regional early literacy specialists completed at least one section of the tool two times on the same teacher to measure improvement over time. The AoC was piloted in 2018-2019 and expected to be fully launched in 2019-2020. However, the ordered school-building closure due to COVID-19 prevented many AoC data from being collected. A total of 19 K-3 and five preschool teachers were observed twice using the same section of the AoC. There was an increase in implementation for four of the six sections (range of 2%-6%), a decrease for one section and no observations for one section.

The AoC was piloted with Cohort 1 regional early literacy specialists in 2018-2019 and utilized by regional early literacy specialists from both cohorts in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Across the three years of implementation, a total of 63 K-3 and 25 preschool teachers were observed twice using the same sections of the AoC. The results of data analyzed for five of the six sections of the tool showed that Cohorts 1 and 2 K-3 and preschool teachers implemented early language and literacy instruction with 80% or more fidelity during the first observation and showed improvements (range of 2% to 18%) in their early language and literacy instruction over time.

Coaching logs captured data for both systems coaching (supporting implementation of Early Literacy Pilot activities) and instructional coaching (supporting implementation of evidence-based early literacy strategies within classrooms) that are being offered as part of Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot. Coaches were able to collect coaching log data and denote whether the coaching occurred in person or virtually.

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

The Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling is a rigorous, multi-year professional learning program. Participants were required to complete pre- and post-knowledge assessment items at two points. The first assessment was administered before beginning Unit 1 and after completing Unit 4. The second assessment was administered before beginning Unit 5 and after completion of Unit 8. To gauge knowledge retention across years, a follow-up knowledge assessment was collected three years later for Units 1 through 4 and two years later for Units 5-8. The follow-up assessment utilized the same 45 multiple choice knowledge assessment items administered at the start of the LETRS professional learning. Since implementation years vary by cohort, follow-up knowledge assessment data was collected for cohort 2 during the 2020-2021 implementation year.

The external evaluation team distributed the LETRS Units 1 to 4 follow-up assessment via email using an online survey system (Qualtrics) to 188 Cohort 2 K-3 pilot teachers who were still teaching in the pilot schools during the 2020-2021 academic year. Of these, 116 teachers had full completion (completed all 45 items) and four had partial completion, which equates to 64% of current pilot teachers providing some level of substantive response. To assess knowledge change over time, analyses were limited to the 105 teachers whose data could be matched across pre-, post- and follow-up assessment. This sample represents 56% of the 188 Cohort 2 K-3 pilot teachers who served in the pilot schools in the 2020-2021 academic year. The percentage of correct scores at pre- or post-test was nearly identical to the larger sample; therefore, findings among the 105 teachers may be generalizable to all teachers who completed the pre- and post-test.

Overall results showed that three years after the initial online Units 1 to 4 professional learning, Cohort 2 K-3 teachers showed an increase in the mean LETRS Units 1 to 4 total percentage correct from 59% at pre-test to 82% at post-test (23 percentage point increase), a decrease from post-test to 74% at follow-up (8 percentage point decrease) and a net increase from pre-test to follow-up (15 percentage point increase).

Two years after the initial online Units 5 to 8 professional learning, results showed that 65% of Cohort 2 K-3 teachers showed a net increase from pre-test to follow-up in total percentage correct scores. Overall, Cohort 2 K-3 teachers showed an increase in the mean LETRS Units 5 to 8 total percentage correct from 70% at pre-test to 84% at post-test (14 percentage point increase), a decrease from post-test to 75% at follow-up (9 percentage point decrease) and a net increase from pre-test to follow-up. Results for units 1-4 and 5-8 indicated that teachers retained the literacy knowledge gained from participating in LETRS online learning and LETRS online professional learning is having some impact on teachers' long-term literacy content knowledge.

An annual survey was administered to all teachers participating in the pilot, regional early literacy specialists, district coaches and building leadership. Results from the survey suggest that teachers had high levels of reading efficacy (they believed they could help students learn how to read). They also reported their literacy instructional practices had changed as a result of participating in the Early Literacy Pilot. For instance, one teacher noted, "I am able to interpret and use reading data more effectively to guide my instruction. I have a deeper knowledge of resources and how to match available resources to the needs of my students." Leadership, regional early literacy specialists and district coaches reported that schools improved their literacy data usage and that, overall, the professional learning contributed to teacher learning.

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

Districts participating in the Early Literacy Pilot were surveyed to determine strengths, sustainability plans and possible supports needed in the following eight components: leadership, Ohio Improvement Process, reading tiered fidelity inventory, curriculum-based measurement screeners, data analysis, science of reading professional development, coaching and family engagement. Results indicated that continued support from the state support team was needed to maintain use and integration of the evidence-based strategies from the Early Literacy Pilot. This team includes members knowledgeable in early literacy practices, the Ohio Improvement Process, special education and early childhood education.

The Department intends to continue supporting the Early literacy Pilot districts with the implementation of evidence-based practices through existing state and regional infrastructure. Pilot districts will have access to regional literacy specialists who can provide continued professional learning on the science of reading, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum and curriculum-based assessments, as well as support districts with systems coaching and implementation of the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory. The Department also will leverage state partnership to continue to support the implementation of the Sit Together and Read and Partnerships for Literacy programs. Ohio's statewide system of support will allow districts outside of the pilot to take advantage of the supports for these evidence-based practices.

Support will be provided to state support team consultants to ensure calibration across all regions of the state regarding the support for implementation of these evidence-based practices integrated within the Ohio Improvement Process. The Department continues to offer professional learning for state support team consultants and educational service providers through the regional literacy network. The Department also hosts a yearly Literacy Academy, which provides professional learning to both regional consultants and school districts.

On Jan. 9, 2021, Governor Mike DeWine signed a set of laws strengthening dyslexia supports for Ohio's children. The new dyslexia support laws establish dyslexia screening measures (ORC 3323.251-<https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3323.251>), professional development for identifying dyslexia and instructing students with dyslexia (ORC 3319.077-<https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3319.077>), a multi-sensory structured literacy certification process for teachers (ORC 3319.078-<https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3319.078>) and the Ohio Dyslexia Committee (ORC 3323.25-<https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3323.25>). The following is a summary of the new set of laws:

- Requires the Ohio Department of Education to establish the Ohio Dyslexia Committee consisting of 11 members;
- Requires the Ohio Dyslexia Committee to develop a dyslexia guidebook for screening, intervention and remediation for children with dyslexia or displaying dyslexic characteristics and tendencies;
- Requires the Ohio Dyslexia Committee to prescribe the number of clock hours of dyslexia-related professional development required for teachers;
- Permits the Ohio Dyslexia Committee to make recommendations regarding ratios of students to teachers who have received certification in identifying and addressing dyslexia, the school personnel who should receive the certification and whether professional development requirements should include completing a practicum;
- Requires the Department, in collaboration with the Ohio Dyslexia Committee, to identify screening and intervention measures that evaluate the literacy skills of students using a multi-sensory structured literacy program;
- Requires school districts and other public schools to administer annual dyslexia screenings beginning in the 2022-2023 school year;
- Phases in over three years dyslexia-related professional development requirements for public school teachers;
- Requires school districts and other public schools, beginning in the 2022-2023 school year, to establish a multi-sensory structured literacy certification process for teachers.

This law will assist the efforts made in the early literacy pilot to be sustained in the participating districts and expanded across the state as the components required align directly with the evidence-based practices used throughout the Early Literacy Pilot.

As Ohio pivots the focus of the SSIP, the evidence-based practices used throughout the Early Literacy Pilot will shift from elementary to the high school level. Data for the next SSIP reporting period will focus on increasing the percentage of students with disabilities who graduate with a regular diploma. The work will include implementation of an early warning intervention and monitoring system.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) collaborated with Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison at the IDEA Data Center for guidance and feedback throughout the entirety of the target setting process. In August 2021, ODE developed a fact sheet for each indicator for which targets were to be set. Multiple data specialists and programmatic experts across the department collaborated to develop each fact sheet. Fact sheets are organized by guiding questions to facilitate individual review of each indicator. Each fact sheet contains data visualizations and narrative describing the indicator measurement, changes to the indicator, data and programmatic considerations, the state's performance over time, two sets of proposed target options and a rationale for each set. Fact sheets are available via ODE's special education target setting webpage (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting>). ODE created an email address specifically for target setting. This email address (specialtarget@education.ohio.gov) was shared with stakeholders via the target setting webpage and used for all external communication regarding target setting.

Indicator fact sheets were posted to the target setting webpage for public comment in September 2021. ODE requested public comment on the proposed target options for each indicator. For each indicator, stakeholders were encouraged to comment with which set of target options they preferred and why. The public comment period was open for five weeks. Commenters were also invited to be part of a virtual stakeholder group that held a series of meetings between November and December to review all public input and finalize the targets across indicators.

ODE provided several reminders of public comment via multiple modes, including one direct email to the 11 largest urban districts in the state, three articles in EdConnection (ODE's newsletter to districts), three articles in the weekly state support team newsletter, one email to the Family Collaborative listserv, and one article to the GovDelivery listserv. Communications delivered multiple reminders via social media outlets, including two posts each to Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as nine Twitter posts. A total of 438 comments were collected on all 11 indicators. Seventy-one (16.21%) of these comments were from individuals who self-identified as parents. Forty-seven people expressed interest in the virtual stakeholder group, thirteen (27.66%) of which self-identified as parents.

During the public comment period, ODE also presented and discussed target options with various stakeholder groups, including Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Deaf Education Network, Disability Rights Ohio, Disparities and Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, Early Childhood State Leadership Team, Guiding Coalition, Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education, Ohio Center for Deaf-Blind Education Advisory Board, Ohio Department of Education staff, Ohio School Boards Association, Professionals Serving Students with Visual Impairments, State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Support Team Directors, the State Support Team/Office for Exceptional Children Workgroup, and attorneys from parent advocacy groups. ODE also held two meetings with the Family Collaborative, including Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) Family and Community Outreach Center, the Outreach Center for Deaf and Blindness, Ohio Statewide Family Engagement Center Advisory Council, the Parent Training and Information Center at the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, Department of Developmental Disabilities Family Group, and Parent Mentors of Ohio.

ODE sent invitations to participate in the virtual stakeholder group in November 2021. ODE invited stakeholders who expressed interest in participating via the public comment period as well as individuals who had recently participated in other special education stakeholder groups for the agency. Two-hundred one invitations were sent, 128 (51%) to individuals who self-identified as parents.

ODE held six two-hour virtual stakeholder meetings in November and December 2021 to review public comment and recommend final targets for each indicator. Indicators were divided into six clusters based on like measures, as follows: Exiting (indicators 1, 2 and 14), Assessment (indicator 3), Discipline and School-age Environments (indicators 4a and 5), Preschool Environments and Outcomes (indicators 6 and 7), Family Involvement (indicator 8) and Dispute Resolution (indicators 15 and 16). Each indicator cluster was facilitated by programmatic experts within the state agency. Participants were divided into indicator clusters based on their individual preferences. Seventy-four individuals participated in the virtual stakeholder meetings, 7 (9.46%) of which self-identified as parents.

The first of six meetings in November 2021 included an introduction and overview of the target setting process from Kara Waldron, the leader of the Office for Exceptional Children data team, and Mary Watson, Ohio's state liaison from the IDEA Data Center. Both Kara and Mary served as facilitators

for the full group meetings. Indicator clusters then broke out into individual virtual spaces to review fact sheets for their assigned indicators and begin to share and review themes from public comment. Facilitators addressed questions from previous meetings in each of the second, third and fourth meetings. Each cluster moved at their own pace in each of these meetings, with Dispute Resolution finishing earlier than other clusters and Assessment needing an additional meeting. During each of these meetings, each cluster finished reviewing their fact sheets and themes from public comment, reviewed and came to consensus on one set of target options and finalized a rationale. Each indicator cluster presented a summary of their fact sheet and discussion as well as final recommendations for target options in the fifth and sixth virtual stakeholder meetings, ending in December 2021.

New SSIP Content Focus

The Department envisions an opportunity to significantly impact the graduation rate of students with disabilities by leveraging concerted efforts designed in the SSIP and aligned with Each Child, Our Future and Each Child Means Each Child. The SSIP Core Team utilized multiple data sources, including annual performance report indicator data, stakeholder feedback, and regional root cause data, and engaged in a series of discussions to clearly illustrate the need to address improved graduation rates and achieve consensus agreement among stakeholders. Further data analyses will focus on district and student-level data collected through Ohio's Educational Information Management System and other data collection processes used by the Department and external evaluators.

Internal Planning and Data Analysis

The Department assembled a core team with the background and expertise needed to design, manage and implement systems change efforts to improve graduation outcomes for students with disabilities. Five staff members from the Office of Whole Child Supports, Office of Career-Technical Education, Office of Improvement and Innovation and Office of Graduate Success will partner with the Office for Exceptional Children to form the SSIP Core Team. Collaborating staff include consultants representing the areas of MTSS, positive behavioral interventions and supports, attendance, career-technical education and graduation success. Office for Exceptional Children staff members include the project's lead content expert and Secondary Transition and Workforce Development consultant, an associate director, the assistant director for Diverse Learners, an educational program specialist for Urban Supports, and a data manager. Also included are a Regional School Improvement and Special Education Compliance consultant representing Ohio's state support teams and an external project manager to ensure the team adheres to the timelines, scope and requirements for developing the SSIP.

Two strategic priorities were instrumental in guiding Department leadership and the SSIP Core Team to the focus of the 2020-2025 SSIP. First, Each Child, Our Future is Ohio's shared plan for ensuring that each student is challenged, prepared and empowered for his or her future by way of an excellent prekindergarten through grade 12 education. Strategy 10 encourages educators to ensure high school inspires students to identify paths to future success and gives students multiple ways to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for high school graduation and beyond. Second, Each Child Means Each Child, a companion document that guides efforts toward meeting the needs of students with disabilities, includes a focus on improving postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities statewide.

Additionally, the 11 District Plan, a focused response to the Doe Settlement Agreement, targets 11 urban districts and includes efforts to provide training to families on graduation requirements and develop a graduation decision framework. Another influencing factor relates to Ohio's determination status of "needs assistance" for two consecutive years on the state's Part B State Performance Plan-Annual Performance Report. The U.S. Department of Education's Office for Special Education Programs considered the state's data on Indicator 1 and Indicator 2 in making this determination.

The SSIP Core Team examined performance data for Indicator 1 and Indicator 2 and reviewed the Department's Indicator Data Fact Sheets to build shared knowledge. The Data Fact Sheets provided detailed information in several areas such as how well Ohio has performed over time and compared to other states; data considerations, including how the data has changed; programmatic considerations such as evidence-based strategies and initiatives that may improve district policies, procedures and practices; and proposed targets that are rigorous, yet attainable. The Core Team discussed the targets, raised questions about the rigor and attainability of reaching the targets and the consequences of not achieving the targets or defined outcomes. The SSIP Core Team and Department leadership concluded that designing a SSIP that focuses on improving graduation outcomes provides an opportunity to leverage efforts across initiatives and provides a targeted opportunity to implement systems change over the next five years. With this clear direction, the SSIP Core Team focused on developing information, materials and strategies to engage and reach consensus among stakeholders.

Stakeholder Input

The Department identified three stakeholder groups that are committed to ongoing work with the Department and have a working knowledge of strategic initiatives, including the previous Early Literacy Pilot. The three stakeholder groups are the Guiding Coalition, regional state support team directors and State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children.

The Guiding Coalition was established to advise the Department in the development of an implementation plan for operationalizing Each Child Means Each Child. The members have credibility within their organizations and the larger education arena and the expertise to contribute to shaping change efforts. As such, members not only advise on the development of the implementation plan but also serve as champions for the work, communicate the work as it's being developed and bring feedback from the field as the work progresses. This communication feedback loop is instrumental in supporting the Department in anticipating roadblocks and designing statewide models or approaches that can be used by all Ohio districts to ensure equitable opportunities to learn are provided for every child.

Ohio's 16 regional state support teams are part of the statewide system of support. State support team consultants assist districts and schools in improving student outcomes with a focus on leadership, collaborative team structures to support continuous improvement efforts and inclusive instructional practices. State support teams staff are part of the infrastructure supporting districts that participated in the Early Literacy Pilot and will play an integral role in supporting district in increasing graduation outcomes for students with disabilities.

The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children is an advisory group defined in IDEA, with a purpose to provide broad-based input to the Department regarding policies, practices and issues related to the education of students and youth with disabilities who are between the ages of birth through 21.

The SSIP content lead facilitated discussions with each stakeholder group to familiarize them with Indicator 1, review the data, answer questions about the proposed targets, clarify the Department's intent to address the needs of secondary level students and build consensus for the proposed change.

Each group had an opportunity to review and discuss indicator 1 data and targets. Subsequent meetings were conducted to provide the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the project's proposed Theory of Action and SiMR. The regional state support team directors also were engaged in a preliminary discussion about the regional infrastructure needed to provide training and support to the selected districts.

The feedback received from these stakeholder groups was positive. Most participants leaned toward the more rigorous proposed targets for increasing the percentage of students with disabilities exiting high school with a regular high school diploma. Stakeholders agreed that high expectations for students with disabilities should be prevalent statewide. They were pleased to see the strategic alignment between the SSIP, the 11 District Plan, and Each Child Means Each Child.

The Department will meet regularly with these stakeholder groups throughout each stage of the process to develop, implement and evaluate the SSIP.

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

Stakeholders continue to play an advisory role in implementing the Early Literacy Pilot. These groups receive periodic updates on project activities or convene meetings to review data, address challenges or plan next steps that align Ohio's literacy efforts to state and regional initiatives.

The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, which meets four times per year, often reviews the State Systemic Improvement Plan evaluation and provides input specific to students with disabilities and family and community engagement.

State support teams are an integral part of Ohio's infrastructure, which supports district efforts to improve literacy outcomes for all students. State support team directors are represented on the State Systemic Improvement Plan Stakeholder Team and the Guiding Coalition. The directors provide input on implementing the State Systemic Improvement Plan and regional needs relative to improving literacy instruction during their monthly meetings. State support team directors have a direct role in sustaining the state's literacy efforts by supervising the regional early literacy specialists' work with

assigned districts and their collaborative efforts to lead regional literacy networks with Ohio Improvement Process facilitators and family engagement leads.

Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan Stakeholder Team reviewed implementation progress and evaluation data and assisted the Department with decisions about sustainability efforts that will move the state's literacy plans forward. This team is comprised of Early Literacy Pilot participants, regional and Department staff and representatives from partner agencies. The SSIP Core Team convened two virtual meetings with Early Literacy Pilot stakeholders May 29 and June 9, 2020. The meetings were designed to update stakeholders on the progress of teachers and students participating in Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot and plan for sustaining and continuing to enhance the infrastructure developments of Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan at the state and regional levels. Stakeholders also provided input to inform the Department's next steps in creating resources and tools and tiered learning opportunities specific to Tier 2 and Tier 3 literacy instruction. Support was provided by the National Implementation Research Network's State Implementation and Scale-up on Evidence-Based Practices. The University of Cincinnati external evaluation team provided an update on the project evaluation.

Through small-group discussions, stakeholders completed an SSIP Infrastructure Development Rubric and the Infrastructure Development Planning Tool. The discussions that followed allowed stakeholders to reflect on the infrastructure work completed in relation to the implementation drivers (competency, organizational and leadership drivers) for each implementation stage through Phases I and II of the and determine where they are now in Phase III. Stakeholders identified strengths, shared suggestions for improvement and identified support needed from the state to scale up the literacy work to more schools. Examples of themes that emerged from both meetings are provided below.

Suggestions for Infrastructure Improvements

Capacity Building

- Build internal capacity by connecting the SSIP to the work of each Department specifically and strategically.
- Provide a clear definition of multi-tiered system of support, how it should work, why the state is doing it and what it looks like when students are moved from Tier 2 to Tier 3 supports.
- Develop a "common" definition of specially designed instruction with clear guidance, enabling teachers to make appropriate decisions about the length and intensity of Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions and supports that meet individual student needs.
- Develop efforts to move this work into the adolescent arena. and look at all tiers of instruction for students with and without disabilities.

Collaboration/Coordination

- Collaboration and partnering with state support teams and the Department should continue and include educational service centers. The educational service centers deliver much of this academic content and professional development on assessments.

Supports from the State to Scale up

- Provide opportunities for aligning plans using literacy as a lever for school improvement.

Many of the stakeholder team recommendations are incorporated in various strategic plans, including the Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement, Each Child Means Each Child and performance agreements with the state support teams.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Pilot participants shared concerns through implementation progress reports, a structured feedback opportunity offered twice each year. Concerns about pilot implementation were shared in terms of additional support or technical assistance needed and barriers or challenges identified. The concerns were not specific to implementation throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department reviewed these reports to identify commonalities.

Multiple districts engaged in the pilot requested additional support in the analysis, interpretation and use of data and the availability of coaching.

Requests submitted by single districts included the need for PBIS implementation training, support for Tiers 1, 2 and 3 instruction, continued access to professional development and networking for coaches and administrators. The Department responded to these requests for support and technical assistance by providing continued access to professional learning opportunities and using the state's regional infrastructure, including state support team consultants, regional early literacy specialists and Ohio literacy leads, to deploy additional needed supports.

A barrier to pilot implementation shared by several participating districts included the data dashboard built for the collection and sharing of data between pilot districts, state support staff and external evaluators. Concerns included the dashboard being difficult to navigate and time consuming. Other concerns shared by multiple districts included staff turnover at the district level, frequent absences, hesitancy to participate in coaching, differentiation of instruction in Tier 1 and managing time for coaching and training. The Department responded to these concerns through direct, targeted, state-level discussions with districts and by making significant adjustments to simplify the data dashboard.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

As previously mentioned, Ohio plans to transition the focus from implementing the Early Literacy Pilot and two related SiMRs outlined in this report to a State Systemic Improvement plan that supports Indicator 1 — to increase the percent of youth with individualized education programs exiting high school with a regular high school diploma — while sustaining the initiatives developed in the Early Literacy Pilot.

Two major statewide initiatives and their related activities will continue to support and expand the professional learning and regional infrastructure that emerged from the Early Literacy Pilot. First, recent state legislation enacted House Bill 436 (https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/solarapi/v1/general_assembly_133/bills/hb436/EN/05?format=pdf) on dyslexia screening, intervention and remediation. This bill requires the Department, in collaboration with the Ohio Dyslexia Committee, to identify screening and intervention measures that evaluate students' literacy skills using a multi-sensory structured literacy program. The bill also requires school districts and other public schools to establish a multi-sensory structured literacy certification process for teachers beginning in the 2022-2023 school year. Screening at-risk students and using intervention measures appropriately could affect the reading proficiency rate of Ohio's students.

The second initiative with statewide implications involves the Department's efforts to define a statewide multi-tiered system of supports model. In March 2021, the Office for Exceptional Children released Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities. This plan includes the anticipated development and implementation of an integrated model for a statewide multi-tiered system of supports. The proactive approaches of an integrated multi-tiered system of supports build on the early literacy pilot model and address the needs of all students while deploying highly personalized strategies to meet individual needs and improve student achievement.

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

These statewide activities contribute to building teacher capacity to develop emergent literacy skills and deliver high-quality reading instruction across content areas so that all students, including students with disabilities, will have access to high-quality instruction and interventions that meet their individual needs. As Ohio moves into full implementation of the dyslexia requirement, the regional professional learning infrastructure will provide ongoing professional learning geared toward supporting structured literacy and other dyslexia requirements. Districts will begin to administer annual dyslexia screenings beginning in the 2022-2023 school year. Professional development requirements for teachers will be phased in over three years. Beginning in the 2022-2023 school year, districts will establish a multi-sensory structured literacy certification process for teachers. The multi-tiered system of support built through the Early Literacy Pilot and outlined in Each Child Means Each Child is being utilized in the dyslexia guidebook which will be in effect for the 2022-2023 school year.

Ohio's strategic plans will determine specific measurement and data collection procedures for these initiatives and activities. Student proficiency in

reading will continue to be measured through state achievement tests reported by districts through the Department's Educational Management and Information System and likely will be reflected in the annual performance report Indicator 3. Data related to the Early Literacy Pilot state-identified measurable outcomes will no longer be directly reported on Indicator 17, as the Department will be shifting the focus of the 2020-2025 State Systemic Improvement Plan to graduation.

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

Participating teachers in both cohorts completed a survey where they were asked to reflect on existing supports still needed. The most requested support that teachers identified as a barrier to their teaching was a need for more support with differentiation. Teachers reported they wanted more support for the different levels of reading skills their students exhibit — for both struggling and gifted readers. They also wanted aides, paraprofessionals and volunteers to help them with small-group activities. Teachers also reported a need for more materials like decoders, reading series and books that are engaging for all readers. Finally, teachers wanted more time and access to coaching support. The Early Literacy Pilot has helped address many of these barriers by providing professional learning on differentiation, targeting the importance of high-quality instructional materials (specifically literacy materials), the continued support and utilization of the application of concepts tool and continued development of literacy coaches at the state, regional and district levels.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

For the past five years, Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan Early Literacy Pilot focused on developing state, regional and local systems to improve the literacy performance of children with disabilities in grades preK-3. In support of these efforts, strategic initiatives were developed to ensure the Department, educator preparation programs and regional support systems designed to sustain Ohio's literacy efforts are maintained and expanded to meet district needs. The strategic plans below provide the context and roadmap for ongoing efforts to improve literacy outcomes for all students statewide.

Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement

Ohio's focus on building teachers' capacities to provide high-quality, evidence-based, early language and literacy instruction and intervention required a detailed plan that outlined expectations and incorporated key components identified in the Early Literacy Pilot's Theory of Action. Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement is not stagnant and is designed to be a working document to meet state, regional and local needs for supporting language and literacy development. Ohio's State Literacy Team assembled in June 2017 to develop the state's vision and direction for literacy. This team came together again in June 2019 to reflect on two years of development and implementation and provide additional recommendations for accelerating the progress of this work.

This plan articulates a state literacy framework aimed at promoting proficiency in reading, writing and communication for all learners. It is driven by scientific research and encourages a professional movement toward implementing data-based, differentiated and evidence-based practices in all manners of educational settings. Specifically, this plan illustrates the strong language and literacy efforts in place in Ohio and the state's vision to expand and strengthen them to support improvement. Ohio's Early Literacy Pilot supports educators and leaders implementing evidence-based language and literacy strategies as part of their instruction and interventions impacting literacy outcomes for all students.

Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities

Building on Each Child, Our Future and modeling its partnership-based approach, the Ohio Department of Education convened stakeholders to craft a plan aimed at improving learning experiences and outcomes for students with disabilities. Beginning in January 2019 and wrapping up in December 2019, stakeholders and staff from the Department worked together to identify a set of recommendations for increasing literacy skills, improving disproportionality, promoting postsecondary success, fostering inclusive leadership and advancing high-quality instructional practices among educators who serve students with disabilities. These recommendations ultimately resulted in Each Child Means Each Child: Ohio's Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities.

Each Child Means Each Child uses data to illustrate what education looks like for Ohio's students with disabilities. Additionally, it organizes recommendations, tactics and actions to improve these educational experiences into three major focus areas. These include:

- Getting to the Problem Early — Multi-Tiered System of Support;
- Building Educators' and Systemwide Capacity — Professional Learning;
- Educating for Living a Good Life — Postsecondary Readiness and Planning.

The plan also contains stories that demonstrate how student outcomes might improve when the recommendations of the plan are implemented.

Throughout the five years of Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan, the regional early literacy specialists supported districts in the implementation of a multi-tiered system of support while providing professional learning for all educators involved.

Ohio Reading Restart Plan 2020-2021

This document was released to Ohio school districts in June 2020. The resources, assessments and suggestions for professional development are based upon colleagues' experiences from a variety of districts around the state. These are not endorsed by the Ohio Department of Education, nor are they mandated by the Department. They are recommended resources for districts that may choose to use them. Research shows a single process or program will not work for all children. Therefore, districts need to utilize multiple literacy and numeracy measures to reach all children. Theoretical models and high-quality instructional materials associated with the science of reading, including the Simple View of Reading, Scarborough's Rope, the 4 Part Processing System and the Changing Emphasis of Big Ideas of Reading, should be considered during the selection process to ensure resources match the needs of the learner. NOTE: When considering plans for implementing a strong restart, please consider the following:

- Examining the current multi-tiered system of supports and ensuring the systems include universal screening, decision rules, diagnostics and progress monitoring;
- Examining current supports and practices for students not making progress;
- Intentional collaboration focused on planning and implementation between general and special education teachers for reading instruction and supports.

Ohio's Reading Restart Plan 2020-2021 was developed to assist districts in identifying best practices to support all educators in the state of Ohio in reaching each student through a robust multi-tiered system of supports on the path to enjoying lifelong literacy. Teaching literacy skills is the responsibility of every teacher. As Ohio looks to "restart and reset" students' missed learning as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to recognize those research-based practices that are recognized as effective for students who have learning challenges and those who are English learners. It is equally important to recognize these strategies work well for all students. Explicit or direct instruction of skills has been validated as a method that, when used correctly, closes the learning gap in less time than other practices.

Districts identified a gap in phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in their current curricula. When this occurred, regional literacy specialists supported districts with the implementation of Heggerty to supplement the Tier 1 instruction, which resulted in growth of teachers' practices and positive student outcomes.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Jo Hannah Ward

Title:

Director, Office for Exceptional Children

Email:

johannah.ward@education.ohio.gov

Phone:

(614) 752-1378

Submitted on:

04/28/22 10:53:34 AM