

## District-Level Special Education Data Reported to the Public

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

The SPP, submitted every six years, must include measurable and rigorous targets for the 17 indicators identified by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education. States must report annually to OSEP on the performance of the state on the targets identified in the SPP through an Annual Performance Report (APR). The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) submitted Ohio's most recent APR in February 2021 based on district data from the **2019-2020** school year.

IDEA also requires each state to annually report to the public on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) on a subset of the targets in the SPP. These required reports must include the state targets for each of the specified indicators, provide the LEA performance compared to those targets, and indicate whether the LEA met the targets. To meet this federal reporting requirement, ODE annually posts an Excel spreadsheet of LEA data on [the department website](#).

The spreadsheet contains multiple columns for each indicator required in this year's district-level data report. This report presents district-level data from the **2019-2020 school year** (unless otherwise noted), specific to students with disabilities.

The annual report includes data for the following indicators:

- Indicator 1 – Graduation Rate (2018-19)
- Indicator 2 – Dropout Rate (2018-19)
- Indicator 3 – Participation and Performance on State Assessments (2018-19)
- Indicator 4a – Discipline Discrepancies
- Indicator 4b – Discipline Discrepancies by Race
- Indicator 5 – School-age Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
- Indicator 6 – Preschool Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
- Indicator 7 – Preschool Outcomes
- Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement
- Indicator 9 – Disproportionality Across All Disability Categories
- Indicator 10 – Disproportionality in Specific Disability Categories
- Indicator 11 – Initial Evaluation Timelines
- Indicator 12 – Early Childhood Transition
- Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition Planning
- Indicator 14 – Post-school Outcomes

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

For example, if a reader wanted to see the data for Columbus City School District, they would click on the cell labeled “District” and a tiny triangle in it. A drop-down menu of all cell values would appear; they would click on Columbus City. If the reader wanted to see all the data for districts with a graduation rate less than 80 percent, they would click on the cell labeled,

“Graduation Rate,” and select *Number Filters* → *Less Than* in the resulting drop-down list. They would then type “.80” in the Custom AutoFilter textbox that appears.

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

## Reporting Conventions

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

“<10” indicates that the data for an indicator are not displayed due to small group size (i.e., fewer than 10 students), to ensure student privacy. “NR” indicates that the LEA reported no students for the indicator. Not all districts and community schools will have data for all indicators. For example, community schools that do not serve preschool students will not have data for Indicators 6, 7 and 12.

A very brief description of each indicator is provided on the first tab of the Excel file, entitled “Data Notes.” Additional information is presented below.

### Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

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

#### **Indicator 1 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of SWD for whom a graduation date has been reported by the end of the 2018-2019 reporting period}}{\text{Total \# of SWD enrolled for the first time in ninth grade during the 2015-2016 school year}}$$

*Note:* Although this report is based on data from the **2019-2020** school year, the data source and measurement for Indicator 1 is aligned with states’ requirements for reporting graduation data to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the ESEA. Graduation and dropout rate data lag one year, therefore, Indicators 1 and 2 reflect data from **2018-2019**.

### Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

This indicator measures the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out of high school. Ohio’s dropout rate compares the number of dropouts to the total number of students with disabilities ages 14 and above who left school:

#### **Indicator 2 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of SWD (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out*}}{\text{Total \# of SWD who left high school (ages 14-21)}}$$

Indicator 2 reflects dropout data from **2018-2019**; see data note for Indicator 1.

### **Indicator 3b: Participation Rate**

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

#### ***Indicator 3b Calculation***

$$\frac{\text{\# of SWD enrolled on the test date who took the math and reading assessments}}{\text{Total \# of SWD enrolled on the test date who were required to take the test}}$$

*Note:* Although this report is based on data from the **2019-2020** school year, data for Indicator 3 is not available due to the ordered school-building closure brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. Indicator 3 reflects data from **2018-2019**.

### **Indicator 3c: Proficiency Rate**

Indicator 3c measures the percentage of students with disabilities who scored at or above the proficient level on statewide math and reading assessments. Math and reading proficiency rates are calculated as follows:

#### ***Indicator 3c Calculation***

$$\frac{\text{\# of SWD across all grades taking math [or reading] tests who scored at or above the proficient level}}{\text{Total \# of SWD assessed in math [or reading]}}$$

Indicator 3 reflects data from **2018-2019**; see data note for Indicator 3b.

The worksheet indicates whether the LEA met the state's targets for the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in math and reading. These targets were established based on recommendations from Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children.

### **Indicator 4a: Discipline Discrepancies**

At the state level, Indicator 4a measures the percentage of LEAs identified by the state as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. Based on guidance from stakeholders, ODE defines significant discrepancies in discipline rates as those in which the rate of suspension or expulsion for students with disabilities exceeds the rate of suspension or expulsion for students without disabilities by at least 1 percent for three consecutive years.

#### ***Indicator 4a Calculation***

$$\frac{\text{\# of LEAs in which the rate of suspension or expulsion for SWD for >10 cumulative days exceeds that for students without disabilities by at least 1\% for three consecutive years}}{\text{Total \# of LEAs in the state}}$$

At the district level, this indicator reflects the difference in the rates of suspension and expulsion for more than 10 cumulative days between students with disabilities and students without

disabilities. Since discrepancies of 1 percent or more are considered significant, the targets for suspension and expulsion are differences of less than 1 percent.

Notes:

- Beginning in 2019-20, Indicator 4 business rules have been updated to align with disproportionality business rules by considering three years of data, combining suspensions and expulsions into a single calculation, and utilizing a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n-size of 30.
- Data used for this indicator originated in the EMIS Student Attendance Record and Student Discipline Record. These data represent a comparison of percentages of groups of individual students reported to be suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days during the school year, using a minimum group size of 30. For example, if a student had three incidents, four days each, they would have 12 days, and count as one student.
- Total average enrollment of students is derived from the year-end attendance files. Counts are based on full-time enrollment of 180 days. Therefore, a student who was enrolled 90 days counts as 0.5 students; one who was enrolled 45 days counts as 0.25 students.

#### **Indicator 4b: Discipline Discrepancies by Race**

At the state level, Indicator 4b measures the percentage of LEAs identified by the state as having: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs for three consecutive years; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

#### ***Indicator 4b Calculation***

$$\frac{\text{\# of LEAs with a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs for three consecutive years and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy}}{\text{Total \# of LEAs in the state}}$$

Ohio uses a risk ratio method to identify significant discipline discrepancies. ODE identifies significant discrepancies in LEAs with risk ratios above 2.5, using a minimum group size of 30 students with disabilities enrolled and at least 10 students with disabilities disciplined for greater than 10 cumulative days in the racial/ethnic subgroups included in the calculation.

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

Notes:

- Beginning in 2019-20, Indicator 4 business rules have been updated to align with disproportionality business rules by considering three years of data, combining

suspensions and expulsions into a single calculation, and utilizing a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n-size of 30.

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

### **Indicator 5: School-age LRE**

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

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

#### ***Indicator 5 Calculation***

- A. # of SWD inside the regular class at least 80% of the day ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21
- B. # of SWD inside the regular class <40% of the day ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21
- C. # of SWD served in separate facilities ÷ Total # of SWD ages 6 through 21

Percentages are calculated from annual Child Count data. State targets for this indicator were set with targets were established based on recommendations from Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children.

### **Indicator 6: Preschool LRE**

This indicator measures the percentage of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

#### ***Indicator 6 Calculation***

- A. # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program ÷ Total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs
- B. # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility ÷ Total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs

Percentages are calculated from annual Child Count data. Preschool students are counted with their district of residence, regardless of where their services are provided. State targets for this indicator were established based on recommendations from Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children.

### **Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

This indicator measures the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

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

Data for this indicator are collected from the Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Form. LEAs report summary form ratings twice annually (in fall and spring) through EMIS. To be included in the data set, children must have scores from at least two summary forms.

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

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

**Indicator 8: Parent Involvement**

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

**Indicator 8 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of surveys with average scores indicating that schools facilitated parent involvement}}{\text{Total \# of parent surveys received}}$$

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

The spreadsheet includes Indicator 8 data for the LEAs that participated in the survey process during **2019-2020**. Furthermore, in accordance with privacy guidelines, the worksheet only displays performance percentages for LEAs that collected 10 or more parent surveys.

To determine the percentage of surveys indicating that schools facilitated parent involvement, OEC divided the number of surveys with an average response of 3.5 or above by the total number of surveys collected by the district. Each survey question offered five responses, and numbers one through five were assigned to each response as follows: 1=Very Strongly Disagree, 2=Strongly Disagree, 3=Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree, 6=Very Strongly Agree. The average response of 3.5 indicates that the parent agreed with more items than he disagreed with, and therefore reported a stronger agreement than disagreement with the concept of his parental involvement.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionality Across All Disability Categories**

At the state level, this indicator measures the percentage of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

**Indicator 9 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of LEAs with disproportionate representation across all disability categories}}{\text{Total \# of LEAs in the state}}$$

Ohio uses a risk ratio method and considers multiple years of data to identify disproportionate representation in special education. ODE identifies disproportionate representation in LEAs with risk ratios above 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum group size of 30 for the denominator and a minimum cell size of 10 for the numerator.

LEAs identified with disproportionate representation for Indicators 9 or 10 are determined to have significant disproportionality. These LEAs must redirect 15% of their federal special education funds to address the disproportionality through coordinated early intervening services.

**Indicator 10: Disproportionality in Specific Disability Categories**

Whereas Indicator 9 measures the percentage of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups across all disability categories, Indicator 10 measures the percentage of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

**Indicator 10 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of LEAs with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories}}{\text{Total \# of LEAs in the state}}$$

Ohio uses a risk ratio method and considers multiple years of data to identify disproportionate representation in special education. ODE identifies disproportionate representation in LEAs with risk ratios above 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum group size of 30 for the denominator and a minimum cell size of 10 for the numerator.

LEAs identified with disproportionate representation for Indicators 9 or 10 are determined to have significant disproportionality. These LEAs must redirect 15% of their federal special education funds to address the disproportionality through coordinated early intervening services.

**Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timelines**

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

**Indicator 11 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of children with parental consent to evaluate whose initial evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days}}{\text{Total \# of children with parental consent for initial evaluations}}$$

Data used for this indicator originated in the EMIS Special Education Event Record.

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

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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

“Part C” refers to early intervention services for infants and toddlers administered by the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities. “Part B” refers to special education services administered by the Ohio Department of Education for children ages 3 through 21.

### **Indicator 12 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of children found eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays}}{\text{Total \# of children found eligible for Part B}}$$

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

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

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Planning

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

- a) Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment;
- b) Transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals;
- c) Annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs;
- d) Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed; and
- e) Evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

### **Indicator 13 Calculation**

$$\frac{\text{\# of youth aged 16 and above with required transition components in their IEPs}}{\text{Total \# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above}}$$

Data used for this indicator are collected in the EMIS Special Education Event Record and compared to EMIS year-end enrollment files.

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

*Note:* Although transition planning and services are required beginning at age 14 in Ohio, the federal indicator is specific to students with disabilities ages 16 and above.

## Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes

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

### **Indicator 14 Calculation**

- A. # of youth enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school ÷ Total # of youth surveyed
- B. # of youth enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ÷ Total # of youth surveyed
- C. # of youth enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school ÷ Total # of youth surveyed

LEAs selected for survey participation collect surveys from students exiting high school, then collect follow up surveys from those same students one year later. The number of surveys requested from each LEA is based on the number necessary to derive a statewide sample that is representative of Ohio's exiting students with disabilities.

The worksheet for Indicator 14 only includes data for the LEAs that collected follow-up surveys during **2019-2020**. Furthermore, in accordance with privacy guidelines, the worksheet only displays performance percentages for LEAs that collected 10 or more surveys.

To collect data for this indicator, Ohio contracts with the Center for Innovation in Transition and Employment (CITE) at Kent State University.