

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.9%. The FFY 2006 data were 84.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 16.1%. The FFY 2006 data were 15.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 13.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 48.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 30%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 52%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 98.8%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 98%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 49.7% for reading and 43.7% for math.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 51.6% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 45.4% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 63% for reading and 54% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data are 1.4% for suspensions and .1% for expulsions.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 3.6% for suspensions and remains unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of .1% for expulsions.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 4.5% for suspensions and .6% for expulsions.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed the LEA's 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEP, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1467 1195"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>49.98</td> <td>52.0</td> <td>48.4</td> <td>2.02%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>13.83</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>.63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>4.09</td> <td>4.12</td> <td>5.9</td> <td>-.71%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5C and did not meet its target for 5B.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.98	52.0	48.4	2.02%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.83	13.2	12.5	.63%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.09	4.12	5.9	-.71%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.98	52.0	48.4	2.02%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.83	13.2	12.5	.63%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.09	4.12	5.9	-.71%																		
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>																				

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		<p>February 1, 2010.</p>																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1419 1317"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 597 1062 773">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 597 1182 773">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 597 1302 773">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 597 1419 773">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 773 1062 841">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 773 1182 841">2.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 773 1302 841">2.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 773 1419 841">2.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 841 1062 976">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 841 1182 976">23.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 841 1302 976">21.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 841 1419 976">20.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 976 1062 1076">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 976 1182 1076">23.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 976 1302 1076">26.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 976 1419 1076">16</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1076 1062 1177">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1076 1182 1177">23.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1076 1302 1177">22.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1076 1419 1177">21.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1177 1062 1278">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1177 1182 1278">26.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1177 1302 1278">26.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1177 1419 1278">39.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1278 1062 1317">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1278 1182 1317">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1278 1302 1317">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1278 1419 1317">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, valid and reliable progress data. The State provided the required information.</p>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.8	2.7	2.4	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	23.2	21.4	20.2	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23.9	26.7	16	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23.3	22.9	21.9	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26.9	26.5	39.5	Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100%	100%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.8	2.7	2.4																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	23.2	21.4	20.2																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23.9	26.7	16																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23.3	22.9	21.9																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26.9	26.5	39.5																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100%	100%																											

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 90%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 86.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 82.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected in the fall of 2008.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s July 1, 2008 (FFY 2008) IDEA Part B grant award included special conditions that required the State to provide two progress reports regarding the State’s implementation of the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124. The first progress report received by OSEP on October 15, 2008 stated that 1,979 Part B eligible children transitioned from Part C to Part B from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, and that 1,855 or 93.7% had an IEP developed and implemented by the child’s third birthday. The State subsequently revised its data in the FFY 2007 APR and is now reporting 96.5% for the July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008 time period. The second progress report required the same data for</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the July 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008 time period. The State reported for the second time period that 675 Part B eligible children transitioned from Part C to Part B, and that 643 or 95.4% had an IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. As the State is reporting 18 consecutive months of substantial compliance the Department is removing the special conditions on Ohio's IDEA Part B grant award.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 91.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with regard to the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 86.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 79%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 99.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 495 of 512 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, five of seventeen findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009, and the State reported that it is following up regularly with the LEAs and has scheduled meeting with the LEAs to review specific requirements and provide technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.4%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 50.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 53.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 68.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 88%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 94.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>