

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY18**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2020**

**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

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

969

#### 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 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](http://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](http://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. The 2019 conference achieved the highest-ever attendees, presenters, sessions, and exhibitors, with more than 3,000 participants from across the state and country.

### **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 students with disabilities.**

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

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

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

YES

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

OEC has previously reported to the public on APR indicators through web postings, meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations (including SAPEC) 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 measurable and rigorous indicator targets. After submission to OSEP, OEC posted the FFY 2017 (2017-2018) APR to the department website (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>).

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

Ohio provided the data and information described above in its Phase III, Year 4 State Systemic Improvement Plan Report.

**Intro - OSEP Response**

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

**Intro - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2018	51.37%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	78.20%	80.50%	82.80%	85.10%	72.30%
Data	68.90%	68.41%	67.01%	69.57%	70.45%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	73.80%	75.40%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

The targets for Indicator 1 must align with those established for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reporting. Ohio's four-year cohort graduation rate targets were set as part of the state's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, available here: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Every-Student-Succeeds-Act-ESSA>

Detailed information about stakeholder input into the content of Ohio's ESSA State Plan can be found here: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Every-Student-Succeeds-Act-ESSA/ESSA-Stakeholder-Engagement>

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	11,346
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	22,085
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	51.37%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
11,346	22,085	70.45%	73.80%	51.37%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The slippage from SY 2016-17 to SY 2017-18 is due to a change in measurement, resulting in SY 2017-18 as a new baseline for Indicator 1. Beginning with the 2017-18 data, the Ohio Department of Education adjusted the business rules for students counted as graduates to align with ESSA requirements. Though Ohio only has one regular high school diploma and does not have a certificate, students with disabilities are not counted as graduates receiving a regular high school diploma if they do so by meeting modified requirements not available to students without disabilities. These modified requirements are explained below, as "the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet." As a result of this change in measurement, the number of youth with IEPs counted as graduating with a regular high school diploma decreased from 14,377 in SY 2016-17 to 11,346 in SY 2017-18.

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.**

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

- 1) Complete 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 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 these pathways were met, two additional options for graduation were available to the classes of 2018 and 2019:

Option 1 - Available to all students in the classes of 2018 and 2019

- Attendance rate of 93 percent during the 12th-grade year;
- Earn a GPA of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale in all courses completed during 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 - Available to students in the classes of 2018 and 2019 in career-technical programs

Students must take and pass courses that constitute the 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 classes of 2018 and 2019, see <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Ohio-s-Graduation-Requirements/Earning-an-Ohio-High-School-Diploma-for-the-Class>

**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)**

As described in the "reasons for slippage" section, this year's data represent a new baseline for Indicator 1, due to a change in measurement.

### **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

### **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (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 C009.

OPTION 2:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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:

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2013	21.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	5.28%	21.90%	21.80%	21.70%	21.60%
Data	21.60%	16.69%	24.12%	20.26%	20.89%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	21.50%	21.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	10,564
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	6,122
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	47
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	4,369
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	76

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,369	21,178	20.89%	21.50%	20.63%	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 his relationship with the LEA. The most recent withdrawal code for each student determines his 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, he is counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports him as not having withdrawn, he is 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, he is counted as a dropout; if another LEA reports him as not having withdrawn, he is 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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 2 - Required Actions

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.50%	97.00%	97.00%	97.50%	98.00%
A	Overall	98.60%	Actual	99.03%	98.03%	99.33%	98.72%	98.85%

### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.50%	97.00%	97.00%	97.50%	98.00%
A	Overall	98.60%	Actual	98.95%	97.72%	99.31%	98.69%	98.69%

### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.00%	98.70%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.00%	98.70%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

In order to meet the requirement for the FFY 2019 target to demonstrative improvement over the baseline year, the Indicator 3B targets have been set at 98.7%. Ohio's stakeholder advisory panel and OEC agree that the state should strive to meet all requirements for setting indicator targets.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	21,957	21,207	21,192	21,304	20,756	19,618					20,462
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,579	5,116	4,920	4,869	4,583	4,149					4,684
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,925	13,486	13,623	13,655	13,476	12,753					12,630
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2,372	2,503	2,523	2,627	2,470	2,484					2,602

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	21,204	21,246	21,154	21,254	20,736	19,706					20,299
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,389	5,194	4,901	4,876	4,617	4,221					4,666
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,331	13,422	13,580	13,583	13,382	12,713					12,322
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2,375	2,505	2,524	2,629	2,471	2,485					2,609

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	146,496	145,029	98.85%	98.00%	99.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	145,599	143,795	98.69%	98.00%	98.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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.

Ohio's Report Card Advanced Reports feature allows the public to access student data by demographic characteristics and test types at <https://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/advanced>

See the attachment entitled "Accessing Ohio's Public Reports of Assessment Participation and Performance" for instructions to access the required reports on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2015	Target >=	55.90%	38.56%	24.18%	24.18%	24.68%
A	Overall	24.18%	Actual	55.11%	38.56%	24.18%	28.39%	34.45%

### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2015	Target >=	45.60%	34.19%	28.57%	28.57%	29.00%
A	Overall	28.57%	Actual	44.12%	34.19%	28.57%	29.55%	33.58%

### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	25.18%	25.18%
Math	A >=	Overall	29.50%	29.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	21,876	21,105	21,066	21,151	20,529	19,386					19,916
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,249	1,472	1,505	776	1,062	602					849
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,085	3,159	3,841	1,813	2,873	1,695					2,593
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,861	2,101	2,177	2,227	2,138	2,138					2,059

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	21,095	21,121	21,005	21,088	20,470	19,419					19,597
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,330	2,177	1,327	1,066	876	924					392
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above	3,638	5,135	3,492	2,715	2,292	2,756					1,160

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,557	1,801	1,910	1,841	1,807	1,808					1,971

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	145,029	43,275	34.45%	25.18%	29.84%	Met Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	143,795	42,975	33.58%	29.50%	29.89%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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.

Ohio's Report Card Advanced Reports feature allows the public to access student data by demographic characteristics and test types at <https://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/advanced>

See the attachment entitled "Accessing Ohio's Public Reports of Assessment Participation and Performance" for instructions to access the required reports on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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	2016	8.77%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	2.00%	1.70%	1.40%	8.77%	8.47%
Data	3.66%	4.41%	5.21%	8.77%	5.74%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	8.17%	8.17%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

157

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
43	772	5.74%	8.17%	5.57%	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 nondisabled students by at least 1%, based on a minimum group size of 30 for both students with disabilities and typical students, as well as a minimum of 5 students with disabilities disciplined.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 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 behavior 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**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.**

OEC required each of the LEAs with findings of noncompliance for Indicator 4a to: (1) correct each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (first prong of correction); and (2) develop and implement a corrective action plan that included revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements.

After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices, OEC reviewed records of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during a specific time frame in a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with discipline requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

OEC required each LEA with an Indicator 4a finding to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements, OEC reviewed records of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during a specific time frame in a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with discipline requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each LEA with an Indicator 4a finding, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified as missing one or more required discipline elements, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

The State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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	2016	1.42%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.19%	1.20%	1.20%	1.42%	0.53%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

5

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
31	10	924	0.53%	0%	1.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable**

Slippage occurred due in part to the increase in the number of districts identified with significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity, from 27 to 31. Additionally, the patterns of noncompliance found during the Ohio Department of Education's review of the 31 districts resulted in a higher number (i.e., 10) being identified with policies, procedures, or practices that do not comply with discipline requirements. An analysis in the patterns of noncompliance revealed the specific reasons for slippage to be 1) manifestation determination reviews that were incomplete or not completed within timelines; and 2) functional behavioral assessments and behavioral intervention plans that were not completed or not reviewed as required.

**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 Asian 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 who are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

To identify discipline discrepancies, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) uses a 3.5 risk ratio threshold, based on a minimum group size of 30. Thus, an LEA must enroll at least 30 students with disabilities in a racial subgroup and 30 typically developing students in order to be included in the calculation for this indicator. Additionally, at least 5 students with disabilities in the specified racial group must be disciplined to be included in the calculation for this indicator.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 by race 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 by race 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 behavior 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**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.**

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 behavior 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

OEC required each LEA with an Indicator 4b finding to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After all corrective actions were completed, including the revision of policies, procedures and practices related to IDEA discipline requirements, OEC reviewed records of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during a specific time frame in a subsequent reporting period. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance with discipline requirements. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each LEA with an Indicator 4b finding identified, OEC reviewed student records to verify correction for each student identified as missing one or more required discipline elements, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 have corrected the noncompliance, 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs 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

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

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

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%
A	50.60%	Data	62.81%	63.92%	65.13%	65.81%	63.28%
B	2005	Target <=	11.40%	11.10%	10.80%	10.50%	10.20%
B	14.86%	Data	11.83%	11.79%	11.77%	12.41%	11.96%
C	2005	Target <=	4.10%	4.10%	4.10%	4.00%	4.00%
C	4.74%	Data	4.33%	4.04%	3.93%	3.63%	3.60%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	65.00%	65.00%
Target B <=	10.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	4.00%	4.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY

2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	244,671
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	155,893
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,101
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	7,499
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	406
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1,330

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 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	155,893	244,671	63.28%	65.00%	63.72%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,101	244,671	11.96%	10.00%	11.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	9,235	244,671	3.60%	4.00%	3.77%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator. OSEP accepts those targets.

## **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

(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

Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

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.

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	52.20%	52.20%	52.20%	52.30%	52.30%
A	50.60%	Data	55.04%	61.71%	67.05%	68.28%	71.36%
B	2011	Target <=	38.50%	38.50%	38.50%	38.40%	38.40%
B	39.60%	Data	36.54%	29.61%	23.44%	21.80%	18.39%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	52.30%	52.30%
Target B <=	38.40%	38.40%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data

and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	26,419
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	19,320
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,681
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	528
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	19,320	26,419	71.36%	52.30%	73.13%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,211	26,419	18.39%	38.40%	15.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator. 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

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	79.00%	79.40%	79.80%	80.20%	80.60%
A1	64.70%	Data	81.56%	78.51%	83.09%	83.62%	82.64%

A2	2008	Target >=	49.00%	49.60%	50.20%	50.80%	51.40%
A2	47.40%	Data	48.88%	48.09%	49.19%	50.17%	49.70%
B1	2008	Target >=	79.20%	79.60%	80.00%	80.40%	80.80%
B1	65.90%	Data	80.89%	78.56%	81.87%	82.59%	81.60%
B2	2008	Target >=	48.30%	48.90%	49.50%	50.10%	50.70%
B2	45.70%	Data	47.61%	48.29%	47.61%	48.27%	47.73%
C1	2008	Target >=	81.30%	81.70%	82.10%	82.50%	82.90%
C1	66.90%	Data	83.60%	80.73%	82.16%	85.41%	85.42%
C2	2008	Target >=	59.00%	59.70%	60.40%	61.10%	61.80%
C2	59.20%	Data	58.16%	58.10%	66.57%	60.34%	61.13%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	81.00%	81.00%
Target A2 >=	52.00%	52.00%
Target B1 >=	81.20%	81.20%
Target B2 >=	51.30%	51.30%
Target C1 >=	83.30%	83.30%
Target C2 >=	62.50%	62.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

#### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

8,722

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	56	0.64%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,290	14.79%

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,780	31.87%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,550	40.70%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,046	11.99%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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>	6,330	7,676	82.64%	81.00%	82.46%	Met Target	No 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>	4,596	8,722	49.70%	52.00%	52.69%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	68	0.78%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,346	15.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,819	32.37%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,580	41.10%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	897	10.30%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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>	6,399	7,813	81.60%	81.20%	81.90%	Met Target	No 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>	4,477	8,710	47.73%	51.30%	51.40%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	60	0.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,031	11.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,121	24.40%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,956	45.50%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,526	17.55%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	6,077	7,168	85.42%	83.30%	84.78%	Met Target	No 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.	5,482	8,694	61.13%	62.50%	63.05%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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

	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 FFY 2019 for this indicator. 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.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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.

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

### 8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	YES
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	90.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017

Target >=	93.00%	93.20%	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%
Data	92.03%	92.66%	96.05%	95.32%	90.23%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	94.00%	94.00%

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
585	643	90.23%	94.00%	90.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

1,936

Percentage of respondent parents

33.21%

**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.**

According to presentations made during Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) leadership conferences, the survey tools developed by the former National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring were designed to be comparable and both the preschool and school-age surveys use comparable scales, ensuring validity of the results. By using the following method to combine data from preschool and school-age surveys, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) ensures that the reported results are reliable:

- OEC assigns a number to each survey response (1=very strongly disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree, 6=very strongly agree). Invalid values are removed from the data. OEC then calculates a single score for each survey by averaging all responses.
- As a score of 3 corresponds to "disagree" and a score of 4 corresponds to "agree," the 3.5 average indicates that either the parent agreed with more items than he or she disagreed with, or had a stronger agreement than disagreement with the concept of his or her parental involvement.
- OEC combines the number of school-age surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher with the number of preschool surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher to represent the total number of surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher.
- OEC calculates the percentage of parents surveyed who report that schools facilitated parent involvement by dividing the number of surveys with scores of 3.5 or higher by the total number of surveys completed by parents.

	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.**

See Attachment "Ind 8 - Sampling Methodology"

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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.**

Due to declining response rates, underrepresentation in survey samples, and limitations in data utility, OEC has elected to redesign Ohio's Indicator 8 survey process by partnering with The Ohio State University's Statewide Family Engagement Center. This partnership is expected to improve the representativeness of the survey responses as well as enhance the overall quality and utility of the data collected for Indicator 8.

The redesign process will include research and selection of a new survey instrument that will meet the requirements of Indicator 8 with fewer items than Ohio's current 25-item and 50-item surveys. A shorter instrument, along with transition to a web-based, smart-phone friendly survey platform, are likely to improve response rates. Furthermore, the Ohio State team will utilize survey and measurement expertise to identify and address underrepresentation in Ohio's annual survey sample. The team will also leverage existing partnerships with Ohio's State Support Team family engagement specialists and Ohio's parent mentor network to improve meaningful use of the data and stakeholder input.

This redesign of the survey process is still in process and is expected to be in place for the 2019-2020 collection. The existing tool was used for the

2018-2019 collection to prevent gaps in data reporting. To address the underrepresentation detailed below, OEC will oversample urban districts in order to improve response rates in these demographic categories while the existing instrument is still in use.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

The sample surveyed represents parents from one-sixth of Ohio's local education agencies (LEAs) serving children with disabilities and is stratified to ensure proportionate representation from traditional districts, community schools, and state-supported schools. Each LEA uses the same roster sampling method to select parents to complete the survey. The extensive stratification process is designed to provide proportionate representation across the state in the sampling pool, in order to obtain a sample that is representative of Ohio's population of children receiving special education services.

OEC examined the FFY 2018 parent survey response group to determine if it is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the state. Compared to last year's analysis, OEC identified a continuing underrepresentation in response rates for children with disabilities in urban districts (13.90% below the expected response rate). With the rollout of the new survey instrument and improved collection process, OEC is confident that the partnership with The Ohio State University's Statewide Family Engagement Center will improve the survey instrument, process, and representativeness in future response data, as described above.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 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 2017 SPP/APR**

Please see the "Indicator Data" section for the analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, along with the actions the Ohio Department of Education is taking to address areas of underrepresentation.

### **8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the target.

### **8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 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.

## 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 FFY 2018, 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 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2018	0.23%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

#### FFY 2018 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.

112

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5	2	857	0.00%	0%	0.23%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Beginning with FFY 2018 data, Ohio changed its methodology for Indicators 9 and 10 to align with the new methodology for significant disproportionality in identification for special education. The slippage for FFY 2018 is due to the change in measurement for Indicators 9 & 10, as Ohio's new methodology has resulted in more districts being identified with disproportionate representation that is a result of inappropriate identification.

**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 3.5 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)**

FFY 2018 represents a new baseline for Indicator 9, based on the new methodology for identifying disproportionate representation.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the [district/# districts] identified in FFY 2018 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification [is/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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

**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 2018, 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 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2018	0.95%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

### FFY 2018 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.

231

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
30	7	738	0.68%	0%	0.95%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Beginning with FFY 2018 data, Ohio changed its methodology for Indicators 9 and 10 to align with the new methodology for significant disproportionality in identification for special education. The slippage for FFY 2018 is due to the change in measurement for Indicators 9 & 10, as Ohio's new methodology has resulted in more districts being identified with disproportionate representation that is a result of inappropriate identification.

**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 in a specific disability category 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 3.5 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 and disability category.
- 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)**

FFY 2018 represents a new baseline for Indicator 10, based on the new methodology for identifying disproportionate representation.

To address the required actions from OSEP's response to Indicator 10 for the FFY 2017 APR:

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 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 2017.

Response:

Though Ohio's FFY 2017 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 2017 because the department did not have access to FFY 2017 (2017-2018) data until FFY 2018 (2018-2019). Thus, OEC did not identify the district in question, complete the investigation of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, and notify the district of noncompliance until FFY 2018. Ohio will report on the correction of this noncompliance with the FFY 2019 APR, which will cover correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the eight districts identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

**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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2005	93.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.31%	99.14%	99.06%	99.40%	98.79%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
28,801	28,599	98.79%	100%	99.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

202

**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 2018 represent the year-end 2018-2019 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
94	94	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 11 finding, OEC sent notification of noncompliance through the LEA's Special Education Profile. Each LEA was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. OEC reviewed initial evaluation data from a five-month period after implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance and a state-selected sample of student records verified the data reported in EMIS. Thus, OEC determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 11 finding, OEC reviewed student-level data to verify that the initial evaluation was completed, although late, for each student whose initial evaluation was not completed within the 60-day timeline, unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**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.

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.

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2018	91.45%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.16%	98.58%	98.02%	97.99%	99.49%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,664
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,115
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,828

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.	24
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	526
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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	1,828	1,999	99.49%	100%	91.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

As part of its continuous improvement and monitoring processes, the Ohio Department of Education reviewed its business rules to calculate Indicator 12 at the state and district levels. The Department has used the IEP meeting date element when determining the extent to which a school district was compliant with Indicator 12. Through this review, the Department decided to change the data element used to calculate compliance in order to increase rigor and meaningful compliance. To that end, the Department has communicated to LEAs that compliance with Indicator 12 will now be determined by the IEP implementation date instead of the IEP meeting date. The new data element used in the calculation explains the slippage from 2017-18 to 2018-19, as it represents a change in measurement and constitutes a new baseline for Indicator 12. With continued communications, technical assistance, and monitoring efforts, Ohio expects to return to a higher level of compliance over the next two reporting cycles.

**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**

171

**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)**

**Ind 12 - Late Table**

**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.

Data for FFY 2018 represent the year-end 2018-2019 data reported by all LEAs serving preschool children with disabilities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As described in the "reasons for slippage" section, this year's data represent a new baseline for Indicator 12 due to a change in measurement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9		0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

ODE required each LEA identified with noncompliance in FFY 2016 to develop and implement a corrective action plan. ODE reviewed Indicator 12 student-level data following the implementation of corrective actions. For each of these LEAs, the data reflected 100% compliance. Thus, ODE determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for timely transition from Part C to Part B (second prong of correction).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each of the LEAs with an Indicator 12 finding, ODE reviewed student-level data to verify that the LEA implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child was no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Secondary transition: 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 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 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2009	99.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.26%	99.34%	99.27%	99.96%	99.90%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
65,464	65,501	99.90%	100%	99.94%	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.

Data for FFY 2018 represent the year-end 2018-2019 data reported by all LEAs serving students with disabilities.

	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 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

For the LEA with an Indicator 13 finding, OEC sent notification of noncompliance through the LEA's Special Education Profile. The LEA was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. After implementation of corrective actions, OEC reviewed Indicator 13 data from a subsequent reporting period. To demonstrate correction, the data reflected 100% compliance and a state-selected sample of student records verified the data reported in EMIS. Thus, OEC determined that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (second prong of correction).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the LEA with an Indicator 13 finding, OEC verified correction of individual cases by verifying that the students reported without (or with incomplete) transition plans now have complete transition plans in their IEPs, unless the student is no longer enrolled in the LEA (first prong of correction).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 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” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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

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.

#### 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 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. States should consider categories such as race and 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	34.80%	34.80%	34.90%	34.90%	35.00%
A	39.60%	Data	33.70%	29.37%	36.45%	28.81%	27.53%
B	2009	Target >=	70.60%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%
B	62.70%	Data	69.87%	66.55%	76.61%	67.49%	70.86%
C	2009	Target >=	79.30%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%
C	66.60%	Data	78.38%	81.87%	83.95%	83.44%	79.49%

### FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	39.70%	39.70%
Target B >=	75.00%	75.00%
Target C >=	84.00%	84.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data

and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,429
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	394
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	528
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)	39
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).	250

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	394	1,429	27.53%	39.70%	27.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	922	1,429	70.86%	75.00%	64.52%	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)	1,211	1,429	79.49%	84.00%	84.74%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	The Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS) project staff have identified the reason for the slippage in category B is the change in definition for competitive employment. In order to align to the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act definition and requirements for competitive integrated employment, additional questions were asked during post-school interviews to capture all necessary components of this refined definition. Each new component of the definition had to be affirmed during the interview in order to meet the new criteria or the graduate could not be included in the count for category B. The number of graduates included in this category dropped as a result and were captured in the overall engagement of category C.

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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.

	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.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	Ind 14 - 2018-19 Exit and Follow Up Survey Packet

#### **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.**

OLTS project staff from Kent State University annually analyze response data to evaluate the extent to which the sample is representative of Ohio's population of students with disabilities exiting school. These data show only chance variations across gender and most disability categories. However, the analysis revealed a slight underrepresentation of students with Other Health Impairments (18.6% of total exiters versus 17.1% in the OLTS sample), and a larger underrepresentation of African Americans, with 4.3% less representation in the response data than expected (20.8% of total exiters versus 16.5% in the OLTS sample).

	<b>Yes / No</b>
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	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 improve underrepresentation of students with OHI, OLTS project staff have been working with LEAs to identify students with disability categories with the highest risk of drop out in order to solicit additional information on how to contact them one year after exit (as the OHI category has an elevated risk for dropout). They will continue this strategy to improve representativeness in the future. Also, project staff will oversample districts with high populations of African-Americans in order to improve response rates in that demographic category.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Indicator 14 survey was revised to align with Option 2. The revised survey is included as an attachment to this report.

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 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 2017 SPP/APR**

Please see the "Indicator Data" section for the analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the youth surveyed 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, along with the actions the Ohio Department of Education is taking to address areas of underrepresentation.

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator. OSEP accepts those targets.

**14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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.

## 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 is used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	61
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	22

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

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

In order to meet the requirement for the FFY 2019 target to demonstrative improvement over the baseline year, the Indicator 15 target range has been set at 42-51%. Ohio's stakeholder advisory panel and OEC agree that the state should strive to meet all requirements for setting indicator targets.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	50.60%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					41.00% - 49.00%
Data	42.42%	43.04%	50.00%	41.07%	54.17%

#### Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	42.00%	50.00%	42.00%	51.00%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
22	61	54.17%	42.00%	50.00%	36.07%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The number of parties participating in mediation has increased every year since 2014. As a result of more parties choosing to pursue mediation over other methods of settlement, more parties attended the resolution session meeting but decided to mediate instead of entering a settlement agreement at that time. Thus, the overall rate of settlement agreements has declined, resulting in slippage.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator. 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	159
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	57
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	73

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

Ohio's State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) devoted two separate days in the fall of 2014 to setting targets for all applicable indicators. During the first day, participants formed work groups around clusters of indicators.

OEC provided each work group with fact sheets specific to the indicators it was to discuss. Each fact sheet showed historical data, projections of trends based on historical data, and disaggregations of the data by student demographics. At the end of the first day's discussion, the workgroups requested additional data and analyses for consideration, and OEC provided these data prior to the second day of discussion. The new data included analyses of how factors in various combinations (such as poverty, race and gender) affected the indicators for which they were determining targets. The workgroups spent most of the second day reviewing the additional data and identifying suggested targets to bring to the whole group for discussion.

Near the end of the second day, workgroups reported to the entire SAPEC membership on their recommended targets and justification for the targets. The entire membership discussed the recommendations and voted to adopt the proposed targets.

In meetings occurring in November 2015 and January 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to establish new targets for Indicator 2, based on the decision to align the dropout rate calculation with that used for state determinations.

In a meeting occurring in December 2016, OEC worked with SAPEC to revise the targets for Indicator 3c, due to a change in state assessments from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, resulting in new baseline data for math and reading proficiency rates.

To establish targets for FFY 2019, OEC worked with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. The SEA and the stakeholder advisory panel decided to extend the FFY 2018 targets to FFY 2019 for each indicator, while ensuring that all indicator target requirements are met. Extending the FFY 2018 targets maximizes time for an in-depth process to set targets for FFY 2020-2025. This will allow stakeholders to dive deeply into longitudinal data and key factors for each indicator, utilizing multiple meetings to propose recommendations and reach consensus in order to establish six years of targets across indicators.

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	83.50%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=	72.00%				76.00% - 84.00%
Data	79.69%	72.97%	75.84%	76.32%	79.56%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	77.00%	85.00%	77.00%	85.00%

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
57	73	159	79.56%	77.00%	85.00%	81.76%	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 FFY 2019 for this indicator. OSEP accepts those targets.

**16 - 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, Ohio Department of Education

#### **Email:**

johannah.ward@education.ohio.gov

#### **Phone:**

614-752-1378

#### **Submitted on:**

04/29/20 3:51:14 PM