Ohio’s 2022 Special Education Ratings Process

The special education program in a district or school is the basis of success for students with disabilities. Annually, the Ohio Department of Education issues a rating on the performance of the special education program for each district and community school in the state. This is known as the Special Education Rating and meets federal requirements for local education agencies that receive IDEA funding (Section 300.600(a)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)).

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

* Meets Requirements
* Needs Assistance
* Needs Intervention
* Needs Substantial Intervention

Districts submit final special education program data through Ohio’s Education Management Information System (EMIS). The Department used the data for the 2020-2021 school year to create each district’s Special Education Rating.

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

# Rating Criteria

The 2022 rating assesses districts’ performance on the following compliance measures:

* Discipline discrepancies by race (Indicator 4b)
* Disproportionality in identification into special education and specific disability categories (Indicators 9 & 10)
* Initial evaluation timelines (Indicator 11)
* Early childhood transition (Indicator 12)
* Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13)
* Timely correction of noncompliance (Indicator 15)
* Timely and accurate data reporting (Indicator 20)
* Special education audit findings

Future ratings will also include:

* Standard reading proficiency rates for students with disabilities (Indicator 3c)
* Standard math proficiency rates for students with disabilities (Indicator 3c)
* Alternate assessment rates for reading and math
* Graduation rate for students with disabilities (Indicator 1)
* Dropout rate for students with disabilities (Indicator 2)

# Enforcement Actions

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

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

| **Category** | **Enforcement Actions** |
| --- | --- |
| Needs Assistance (Year 1) | Inform districts of technical assistance available from State Support Teams (SSTs) and other resources. |
| Needs Assistance (Year 2) | Require a district self-review and improvement plan to address compliance indicator(s) with lower scores. |
| Needs Intervention | Require a district self-review and improvement plan to address the compliance and/or student results indicator(s) with lower scores.  |
| Needs Substantial Intervention | * Withhold, in whole or in part, any Part B funds;
* Require completion of specific corrective actions before release of funds; and
* Require intensive SST support.
 |

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

# Calculating Ratings

To determine each district’s overall rating, the Department totals the points across the compliance measures and divides that total by the number of measures for which the district has data. The total number of measures can be up to eight and not every district has data for every measure each year. This is the **compliance score**.

The 2022 Special Education Rating is based entirely on compliance indicators. There is no results score for the 2022 rating. The compliance score is equal to the **overall score**. Beginning with the 2023 Special Education Rating, the results indicators will be included in a projected rating.

The overall score corresponds to a point range for each rating category, as shown in the table below.

| **Overall Score** | **2022 Rating** |
| --- | --- |
| 3.75 – 4.00 | Meets Requirements |
| 3.00 – 3.74 | Needs Assistance |
| 1.25 – 2.99 | Needs Intervention |
| 0.00 – 1.25 | Needs Substantial Intervention |

# Performance on Compliance Indicators

### Indicator 4b: Discipline Discrepancy by Race

Indicator 4b measures significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) *and* policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 4b is a risk ratio less than or equal to 2.50 for three consecutive years.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 EMIS year-end discipline and enrollment files, calculated to identify districts with significant discrepancies.

#### Notes

The measurement for Indicator 4b requires the following two steps:

1. The Department identifies significant discipline discrepancies in districts with risk ratios greater than 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30.
2. Districts with significant discipline discrepancies complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding records, the Department determines if the district has policies, procedures or practices that do not comply with IDEA discipline requirements.

Points for Indicator 4b are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicator 4b Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | District does not have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs *and* policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy. |
| 1 | District has a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs *and* policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.  |
| NR | District does not meet the minimum cell size of 10 or n-size of 30. |

### Indicators 9 and 10: Significant Disproportionality in Special Education Identification

Indicators 9 and 10 measure disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups into special education and related services across all disability categories (Indicator 9) and specific disability categories (Indicator 10) that is the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Target

The target for Indicators 9 and 10 is a risk ratio less than or equal to 2.50 for three consecutive years.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 EMIS year-end enrollment files, calculated to identify districts with significant risk ratios.

#### Notes

The measurement for Indicators 9 and 10 requires the following two steps:

1. The Department identifies significant disproportionality either across disability categories or within specific disability categories in districts with risk ratios greater than 2.50 for three consecutive years, using a minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30.
2. Districts with significant disproportionality complete a self-review of their policies, procedures and practices relating to the identification of students with disabilities. Using the results of this self-review and corresponding records, the Department determines if the significant disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification.

Points for Indicators 9 and 10 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicators 9 and 10 Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | District does not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (either across disability categories or within specific disability categories). |
| 1 | District has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (either across disability categories or within specific disability categories).  |
| NR | District does not meet the minimum cell size of 10 or n-size of 30. |

### Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations

Indicator 11 measures the percentage of children who were evaluated within 60 calendar days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 11 is 100 percent.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.

#### Notes

There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one initial evaluation in 2020-2021 receive a score for Indicator 11.

Points for Indicator 11 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicator 11 Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | 95% or higher |
| 3 | 75 – 94.99% |
| 2 | 50 – 74.99% |
| 1 | 0 – 49.99% |
| NR | 0 students with initial evaluations in 2020-2021 |

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

Indicator 12 measures the percentage of children referred to Part C (early intervention services) prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B (preschool services), and who have an IEP implemented by their third birthdays.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 12 is 100 percent.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS year-end Special Education Event Record.

#### Notes

There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one student transition from Part C to Part B in 2020-2021 receive a score for Indicator 12.

Points for Indicator 12 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicator 12 Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | 95% or higher |
| 3 | 75 – 94.99% |
| 2 | 50 – 74.99% |
| 1 | 0 – 49.99% |
| NR | 0 students transitioning from Part C to Part B in 2020-2021 |

### Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Indicator 13 measures the percentage of youth with IEPs age 16 and above with an IEP that includes:

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

#### Target

The target for Indicator 13 is 100 percent.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS year-end enrollment files and the Special Education Event Record.

#### Notes

* There is no minimum group size used. All districts with at least one student with a disability age 16 or above in 2020-2021 receive a score for Indicator 13.
* Although transition planning and services are required beginning at age 14 in Ohio, the federal indicator is specific to students with disabilities age 16 and above.

Points for Indicator 13 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicator 13 Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | 95% or higher |
| 3 | 75 – 94.99% |
| 2 | 50 – 74.99% |
| 1 | 0 – 49.99% |
| NR | 0 students with disabilities of transition age in 2020-2021 |

### Indicator 15: Timely Correction of Noncompliance

Indicator 15 measures timely correction of noncompliance and reflects whether the district corrected all findings of noncompliance within the timelines established by the Department.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 15 is no late/uncorrected findings.

#### Data Source

Findings of noncompliance are identified from:

* IDEA monitoring;
* Indicator monitoring (Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13);
* Fiscal reviews;
* Selective reviews;
* Complaints; and
* Due process hearings.

#### Notes

Indicator 15 is specific to findings made in 2019-2020 and due for correction in 2020-2021.

Points for Indicator 15 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

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

### Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data

Indicator 20 measures whether district-reported data are timely and accurate.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 20 is no data issues.

#### Data Source

Timely and accurate data reporting is evaluated for:

1. Suspensions and expulsions (Indicator 4);
2. Disproportionality (Identification (Indicators 9 and 10), Placement, Discipline);
3. Initial evaluations (Indicator 11);
4. Early childhood transition (Indicator 12);
5. Secondary transition planning (Indicator 13);
6. Alternate assessment participation; and
7. Other EMIS data reported for students with disabilities.

#### Notes

Data are considered inaccurate if student records or other documentation do not match the data reported in EMIS, as determined through reviews completed by the Department.

Points for Indicator 20 are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Indicator 20 Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | All data are timely and accurate. |
| 3 | One component of 1-7 (above) is not timely or accurate. |
| 2 | Two components of 1-7 (above) are not timely or accurate. |
| 1 | Three or more components of 1-7 (above) are not timely or accurate. |

### IDEA Audit Findings

IDEA audit findings measure the severity of audit findings during the 2020-2021 school year.

#### Target

No audit findings.

#### Data Source

Single audits conducted by the Ohio Auditor of State’s Office during the 2020-2021 school year.

#### Notes

* Scores of less than 4 are assigned to districts with IDEA-related audit findings whose reports were released by the Auditor of State by July 1, 2022.
* Click [here](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/299EAB25-0283-4745-9175-287FB3908754?tenantId=50f8fcc4-94d8-4f07-84eb-36ed57c7c8a2&fileType=pdf&objectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fohiodas.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2F2019-2020SpecialEducationProfiles%2FShared%20Documents%2F2022%20Special%20Education%20Ratings%2FMaterials%2FSpecial%20Education%20Ratings%20-%20Examples%20of%20Audit%20Findings.pdf&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fohiodas.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2F2019-2020SpecialEducationProfiles&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:6895312b7f32411c96d5de248d7ed4df@thread.skype&groupId=8ed9b740-e8d1-4287-a0ff-cdab882b14cd) for examples of minor, moderate and major audit findings.

Points for IDEA audit findings are assigned to districts based on the criteria described in the table below.

| **Audit Points** | **Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | No IDEA audit findings |
| 3 | Minor monitoring and/or reporting issues which can be easily remedied by implementing procedures according to [Uniform Guidance](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200). |
| 2 | Moderate documentation and/or reporting issues which would require revision of internal financial processes. |
| 1 | Major financial tracking issues which would require the initiation of appropriate financial and accounting procedures. |
| NR | Not audited in 2020-2021. |

# Performance on Results Indicators

Results indicators were included in the ratings beginning in 2018. Due to federal changes in Indicator 3 (math and reading proficiency), statewide testing data will not be included in the 2022 Special Education Ratings.

### Participation in Alternate Assessments

Participation in alternate assessment measures the percentage of students participating in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities in math and reading.

#### Target

The target for participation in alternate assessments is less than or equal to one percent.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2020-2021 EMIS Assessment and Student Collections.

#### Notes

* This calculation reflects the number of students taking the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities, divided by the number of all students tested, and is calculated separated for math and reading.
* This calculation includes all students tested in grades 3-8 and high school. For high school, the math rate includes end of course exams in Algebra I, Geometry, Math I, and Math II. The reading rate includes end of course exams in English I and English II.
* Participation in alternate assessments is not yet included in the ratings calculation and is offered for continuous improvement planning. Future ratings will include alternate assessment participation rates.

### Indicator 3b: Reading and Math Standard Proficiency Rates

Indicator 3b measures the proficiency rate for students with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards, calculated separately for reading and math, within grades 4, 8 and high school.

#### Target

The targets for Indicator 3b are listed in the table below.

| **Indicator** | **2020-21 Target** |
| --- | --- |
| Grade 4 Reading Proficiency Rate – Standard | 21.86% or greater |
| Grade 8 Reading Proficiency Rate – Standard | 10.97% or greater |
| High School Reading Proficiency Rate – Standard | 17.84% or greater |
| Grade 4 Math Proficiency Rate – Standard | 26.83% or greater |
| Grade 8 Math Proficiency Rate – Standard | 13.94% or greater |
| High School Math Proficiency Rate – Standard | 6.77% or greater |

#### Data Source

Indicator 3b uses the same data as used for federal reporting under Title I of ESEA, using Ed*Facts* file specifications C175 and 178.

#### Notes

* The proficiency rates for Indicator 3b are based on all students with IEPs, including both students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
* This indicator is new beginning with the 2020-21 school year and replaces the previous Indicator 3c, which measured standard proficiency rate on statewide assessments for all students with disabilities.
* Only students with disabilities who had IEPs at the time of testing are included in the calculations of Indicator 3b.
* Students who retake the same assessment in the same year are only counted once.
* All students in high school grades (9-12) who take the applicable end-of-course exams are included.
* Standard proficiency rates are not yet included in the ratings calculation and are offered for continuous improvement planning. Future ratings will include standard proficiency rates.
* For more information on how targets were set for this indicator, see the [Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage](https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting).

### Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

Indicator 1 measures the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 1 is 60 percent or greater.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2019-2020 EMIS year-end Student Standing, Special Education Event, Special Education Graduation, Assessment, and Student Detail files.

#### Notes

* Beginning with the 2019-2020 data, the graduation rate calculation reflects the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to graduating by meeting the same requirements as students without disabilities, divided by the total number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education.
* Students with disabilities taking alternate assessments, excused from consequences of standard high school assessments or graduating by meeting their IEP goals are included in the total number of youth with IEPs who left special education (the denominator) but not the number of youth with IEPs who graduated with a regular high school diploma (the numerator) for this calculation. These students are not counted as graduates as required for this calculation.
* Graduation rate is not yet included in the ratings calculation and is offered for continuous improvement planning. Future ratings will include graduation rate.
* For more information on how targets were set for this indicator, see the [Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage](https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting).

### Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

Indicator 2 measures the percentage of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to dropping out.

#### Target

The target for Indicator 2 is 16.68 percent or less.

#### Data Source

Data are collected in the 2019-2020 EMIS year-end Student Standing, Special Education Event, Special Education Graduation, and Student Detail files.

#### Notes

* Beginning with the 2015-2016 data, the dropout rate calculation reflects the number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education due to dropping out, divided by the total number of students with disabilities, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education.
* Dropout rate is not yet included in the ratings calculation and is offered for continuous improvement planning. Future ratings will include dropout rate.
* For more information on how targets were set for this indicator, see the [Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage](https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Indicator-Target-Setting)

# Ensure Data Security

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

# Appeals Process

Districts wishing to appeal their ratings must submit a completed appeal form and supporting documentation by **November 3, 2022**.

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

# Public Reporting

The Ohio Department of Education reports annually to the public on the performance of each district’s special education program, including their Special Education Indicator Data and Special Education Rating, on the Department’s [website](https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Special-Education-Data-and-Funding/Ohio-s-Special-Education-Profiles). The Department will add the 2022 ratings to the district-level Special Education Indicator Data report after the appeals period has concluded.