

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.9%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84.6%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP. The State explained the difference.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 16.1%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 13.2%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 44.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 48.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 60%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 98.3%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=973&ContentID=72157&Content=72157</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 48.1% for reading and 43.9% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 69% for reading and 62% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 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>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; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>&TopicRelationID=973&ContentID=72157&Content=72157</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 0.1% for expulsions. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 4.5% for suspensions and .6% for expulsions.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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>The State reported that it did not revise (and did not require LEAs to revise), 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 for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007 because it did not identify any noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 651 1467 1117"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>52.0</td> <td>53.8</td> <td>49</td> <td>1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>12.8</td> <td>11.75</td> <td>0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.12</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>-0.02%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5B.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52.0	53.8	49	1.80%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.2	12.8	11.75	0.40%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.12	4.1	5.5	-0.02%	<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 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52.0	53.8	49	1.80%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.2	12.8	11.75	0.40%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.12	4.1	5.5	-0.02%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>																				

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children through 5 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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 699 1444 1224"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 699 919 813">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 699 1192 813"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 699 1444 813"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 919 951">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 813 1192 951">64.7</td> <td data-bbox="1192 813 1444 951">47.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 951 919 1118">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 951 1192 1118">65.9</td> <td data-bbox="1192 951 1444 1118">45.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1118 919 1224">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1118 1192 1224">66.9</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1118 1444 1224">59.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.7	47.4	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.9	45.7	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	66.9	59.2	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.7	47.4												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.9	45.7												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	66.9	59.2												
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>												

¹ 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 six years of age or exited the program.

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

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 91.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 93.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 91%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported in its FFY 2008 APR its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. 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</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 93.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 86.9%. The State did not meet</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>its FFY 2008 target of 100%. The State reported that 283 of 284 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. Although the State reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP's letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit found that the State was not verifying that the individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected. Further, OSEP also found that the updated data that the State utilizes to determine if the specific regulatory requirements had been met revealed that LEAs were reporting ongoing noncompliance and had thus not implemented the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that noncompliance has been corrected.</p>	<p>report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 284 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the 284 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, 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). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.4%. However, OSEP’s letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit found that the State’s Indicator 12 data was not accurate because LEAs were undercounting the number of children who transition from Part C to Part B. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine that the State’s reported data are valid and reliable and cannot comment on whether the data represent progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State reported that all 72 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. Although the State reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit found that the State was not verifying that the each LEA with individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected and had thus not ensured implementation with the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR 34 CFR §300.124(b). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that noncompliance has been corrected.</p> <p>The State provided a response to the 2009 verification visit report on May 25, 2010.</p>	<p>required data for FFY 2008 in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 72 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with the 72 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely,</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addressing the State’s response to the verification visit report, OSEP will respond to the State under separate cover.</p>
<p>13. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 42 of 43 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. For the remaining finding of noncompliance that was not corrected, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. Although the State reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit found that the State was not verifying that the each LEA with individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected and had thus not ensured implementation of the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR §34 CFR §300.320(b). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that noncompliance has been corrected.</p> <p>The State provided a response to the 2009 verification visit report on May 25, 2010.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 43 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with the remaining 43 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		In addressing the State’s response to the verification visit report, OSEP will respond to the State under separate cover.
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 96.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,966 of 1,973 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that seven findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2010. Although the State reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit found that the State was not verifying that the individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected for Indicators 11, 12 and 13. Further, for Indicator 11, OSEP also found that the updated data that the State utilizes to determine if the specific regulatory requirements had been met</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP’s 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>revealed that LEAs were reporting ongoing noncompliance and had thus not implemented the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1).</p>	<p>timely correction of noncompliance and the OSEP 09-02 memo was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, in its report on its 2009 verification visit, OSEP found that two of 11 complaints</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2008 in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>from 2008-2009 were not resolved within 60 days or a properly extended timeline. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine that the State's data are valid and reliable and cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State provided a response to the 2009 verification visit report on May 25, 2010.</p>	<p>activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p> <p>The State's response to the verification visit report provided the procedures, which if implemented, should ensure resolution of written complaints within the required timelines.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, in its report on its 2009 verification visit, OSEP found that the State did not adjudicate all due process hearing requests within the 45-day timeline or within the timeline that was extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine that the State's data are valid and reliable and cannot comment on whether the data represent progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State provided a response to the 2009 verification visit report on May 25, 2010.</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2008 in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p> <p>In addressing the State's response to the verification visit report, OSEP will respond to the State under separate cover.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 52.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 79.6%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 51%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 53.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 89%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 97.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR 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 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>