

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 82.6%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 82.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 17.4%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 17.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 12.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 48.05%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 48.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 76%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.6% for reading and 98.6% for math. The FFY 2009 data were 98.9% for reading and 98.7% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 97.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p>	<p>school levels with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district, and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this Response Table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 54.3% for reading and 45.7% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 44.3% for reading and 39.2% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 82.1% for reading and 72.7% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards, or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p>	<p>with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this Response Table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 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 [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.33% for suspensions and 0% for expulsions. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.32% for suspensions and remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0% for expulsions. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 1.66% for suspensions and 0.2% for expulsions.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 604 of 913 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 in a group.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise) the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 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) 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 35 districts have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on the FFY 2009 discipline data. The State also reported that 25 districts were identified as having 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.</p> <p>The State reported that it will require the districts to revise their 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010, in order for those districts to demonstrate correction of noncompliance. It is unclear whether this revision has already occurred.</p> <p>The State reported that 196 of 913 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 in a group.</p>	<p>and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise, 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 districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether districts with 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, based on FFY 2009 data, had 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, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that these districts have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		its improvement activities, and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.																				
<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 improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 529 1583 1005"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">57.4</td> <td align="center">58.5</td> <td align="center">59.8</td> <td align="center">-0.59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.4</td> <td align="center">12.0</td> <td align="center">12</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.5</td> <td align="center">4.5</td> <td align="center">3.6</td> <td align="center">-0.82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C.</p> <p>The State's data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3. The State provided an explanation.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.4	58.5	59.8	-0.59%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.4	12.0	12	0.70%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.5	4.5	3.6	-0.82%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.4	58.5	59.8	-0.59%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.4	12.0	12	0.70%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.5	4.5	3.6	-0.82%																		
<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 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>																														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 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="548 581 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 581 957 678"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 581 1163 678"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 581 1373 678"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 581 1583 678"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 678 957 816">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 678 1163 816">82.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 678 1373 816">84.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 678 1583 816">66</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 816 957 987">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 816 1163 987">82.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 816 1373 987">84.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 816 1583 987">68</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 987 957 1089">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 987 1163 1089">83.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 987 1373 1089">85.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 987 1583 1089">67</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1089 957 1187"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1089 1163 1187"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1089 1373 1187"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1089 1583 1187"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1187 957 1325">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1187 1163 1325">49.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1187 1373 1325">51.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1187 1583 1325">49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1325 957 1490">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1325 1163 1490">45.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1325 1373 1490">51.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1325 1583 1490">47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	82.3	84.3	66	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.6	84.3	68	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83.8	85.6	67	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	49.3	51.4	49	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	45.7	51.3	47	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	82.3	84.3	66																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.6	84.3	68																											
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83.8	85.6	67																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	49.3	51.4	49																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	45.7	51.3	47																											

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	59.2	62.5	60	
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. [Results Indicator]	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 89.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 94.03%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 93%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation." The State reported that 193 of 913 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 in a group.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 316 of 913 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 in a group.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2010 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		ensure compliance.
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 117 of 134 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that 62 of 63 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining finding identified in FFY 2008. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		actions the State will take to ensure such correction.
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 23 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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>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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 899 1583 1442"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">39.6</td> <td align="center">41.4</td> <td align="center">40.2</td> <td align="center">2.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">62.7</td> <td align="center">74.5</td> <td align="center">67</td> <td align="center">11.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">66.6</td> <td align="center">81.1</td> <td align="center">67.2</td> <td align="center">14.50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	39.6	41.4	40.2	2.10%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	62.7	74.5	67	11.80%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.6	81.1	67.2	14.50%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	39.6	41.4	40.2	2.10%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	62.7	74.5	67	11.80%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.6	81.1	67.2	14.50%																		

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 89.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 566 of 631 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 58 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that 68 of 69 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining finding identified in FFY 2008. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2009: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the 2011 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 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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
timelines. [Compliance Indicator]		
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 49.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 53.03%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 54.5%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 75.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 81.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.6%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.