

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 82.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 83.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 87.5%.</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).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 17.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 16.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 12.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 48.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 44.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 68%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.9% for reading and 98.7%</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.7% for reading and remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 98.7% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 98.7% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 44.3% for reading and 39.2% for math. These data represent slippage from the 2008 data of 48.1% for reading and represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 43.9% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 76% for reading and 70% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>4. 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; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.32% for suspensions and 0% for expulsions. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 1.4% for suspensions and 0.1% for expulsions. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 1.66% for suspensions and met its FFY 2009 target of 0.2% for expulsions.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 517 of 863 districts in FFY 2008 did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 in the group and were excluded from the calculation.</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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data.</p>	<p>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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>4. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that 857 districts of 863 did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 in the group and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or                      C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.                      The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 363 1583 846"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">53.8</td> <td align="center">57.4</td> <td align="center">49.4</td> <td align="center">3.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.8</td> <td align="center">12.4</td> <td align="center">11.3</td> <td align="center">0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">4.1</td> <td align="center">3.5</td> <td align="center">5.3</td> <td align="center">0.60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2009 target for 5B.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.8	57.4	49.4	3.60%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.8	12.4	11.3	0.40%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.1	3.5	5.3	0.60%	<p>in performance in the FFY 210 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.8	57.4	49.4	3.60%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.8	12.4	11.3	0.40%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.1	3.5	5.3	0.60%																		
<p>6. 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.                      [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and</p>	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010</p>																				

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																																
<p>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.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2012.                      The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 363 1583 1377"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 363 959 461"><u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="959 363 1163 461"><u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 363 1373 461"><u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 363 1583 461"><u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 461 959 597"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 461 1163 597">64.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 461 1373 597">82.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 461 1583 597">65</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 597 959 766"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 597 1163 766">65.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 597 1373 766">82.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 597 1583 766">67</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 766 959 870"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 766 1163 870">66.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 766 1373 870">83.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 766 1583 870">65</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 870 959 967"><u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="959 870 1163 967"><u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 870 1373 967"><u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 870 1583 967"><u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 967 959 1104"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 967 1163 1104">47.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 967 1373 1104">49.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 967 1583 1104">48</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1104 959 1273"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1104 1163 1273">45.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1104 1373 1273">49.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1104 1583 1273">45</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1273 959 1377"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1273 1163 1377">59.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1273 1373 1377">58</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1273 1583 1377">58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>	<u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.7	82.3	65	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.9	82.6	67	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	66.9	83.8	65	<u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	47.4	49.3	48	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	45.7	49.2	45	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	59.2	58	58	<p>APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.7	82.3	65																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.9	82.6	67																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	66.9	83.8	65																															
<u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2008 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Target</b></u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	47.4	49.3	48																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	45.7	49.2	45																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	59.2	58	58																															

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94.03%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 91.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 92%.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that 903 districts of 913 did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 in the group and were excluded from the calculation.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that 888 districts of 913 did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>“n” size requirement of 30 in the group and were excluded from the calculation.</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 conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 93.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 284 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 221 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011 that 284 remaining findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in the FFY 2009 APR. The State indicated that the 284 findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2008 APR were submitted prematurely and are findings that were identified in FFY 2008, not FFY 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State also must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining 63 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>§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 2010 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 found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.9%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2008 data of 97.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit revised data for FFY 2008, and the State provided that data.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 72 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner, and that 72 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011 that 72 remaining findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in the FFY 2009 APR. The State indicated that the 72 findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2008 APR were submitted prematurely and are findings that were identified in FFY 2008, not FFY 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (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, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 99.5%.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011 that 43 remaining findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in the FFY 2009 APR. The State indicated that the 43 findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2008 APR were submitted prematurely and are findings that were identified in FFY 2008, not FFY 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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 reported, under Indicator 15, that none of the 43 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner, and that all were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011.</p>	<p>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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<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>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 39.6% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 62.7% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 66.6% 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>The State provided the actual numbers used in the calculation for this indicator (as instructed in the SPP/APR Measurement Table).</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,215 of 1,620 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 336 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining 69 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must</p>

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and each LEA with remaining 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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12 and 13, in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under that indicator.</p>
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or 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>through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.5%.<sup>1</sup> The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to include in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011 valid and reliable data for FFY 2008 in the FFY 2009 APR. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on the State’s amended 618 data submitted January 21, 2011. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 58.3%.<sup>2</sup> The State met its target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 53.03%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 52.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 51%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

<sup>1</sup> After OSEP’s verification visit the week of October 26, 2009, ODE reviewed the 2008-2009 complaint files and found that one report was not issued within properly extended timelines in addition to two complaints found outside of properly extended timelines identified by OSEP. Therefore, ODE changed the FFY 2008 data for this indicator from 100% to 95.5%.

<sup>2</sup> After OSEP’s verification visit the week of October 26, 2009, ODE reviewed the 2008-2009 adjudicated due process hearing requests and found that there were five cases in which hearing decisions were not issued within timelines or properly extended timelines. Therefore, ODE changed the FFY 2008 data for this indicator from 100% to 58.3%.

**Ohio Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 81.9%. These data are based on the State's amended 618 data submitted January 21, 2011. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 78.8%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 89%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>