

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>Compliance Agreement Reporting: The timely service provision, 45-day timeline, IFSP transition steps and services, timely transition conference, and timely correction requirements of Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8C, and 9 were the subject of a three-year November 8, 2006 Compliance Agreement (Compliance Agreement) between the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and the Ohio Department of Health (ODH). The Compliance Agreement required ODH to ensure compliance with the requirements under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8C, and 9 by November 2009. OSEP’s November 4, 2008 letter responded to ODH’s progress reports under the Compliance Agreement submitted through October 2008. OSEP’s April 30, 2010 letter responded to OSEP’s verification visit to the State and also to the State’s final progress report under the Compliance Agreement, which was received on February 26, 2010. The April 30, 2010 letter confirmed ODH’s efforts to ensure compliance under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8C and 9 and noted that OSEP would respond to Ohio’s IDEA Part C FFY 2008 APR data through this response table and would separately respond to the State’s FFY 2009 APR data in OSEP’s response to Ohio’s FFY 2009 APR, which is not due until February 1, 2011.</p>		
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [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%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 62 of 63 findings of noncompliance identified in November 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the one uncorrected FFY 2007 finding of noncompliance.</p> <p>As noted above, the timely service provision requirements of this indicator were the subject of the Compliance Agreement. OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, and in its final progress report, data demonstrating that the remaining five counties the State identified as being in noncompliance in November 2007 were corrected. The State provided all of the required information with its final progress report. OSEP responded to the State’s progress report and information in OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p>	<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 service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). 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>The timely service provision requirements of this indicator were the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP responded to the State’s efforts to ensure compliance in OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter and looks forward to the State’s FFY 2009 data in the FFY 2011 APR. 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 one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identified in FFY 2007 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each county with remaining noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator, and each county identified with noncompliance FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(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 initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the county, 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>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [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 90%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 88%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); 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="548 492 1444 1037"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 492 921 626">08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="921 492 1194 626"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1194 492 1444 626"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 626 921 763">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="921 626 1194 763">63</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1194 626 1444 763">63.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 763 921 932">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="921 763 1194 932">62.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1194 763 1444 932">62.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 932 921 1037">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="921 932 1194 1037">62.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1194 932 1444 1037">63.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	63	63.3	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.9	62.9	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	62.5	63.5	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	63	63.3												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.9	62.9												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	62.5	63.5												
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights;</p> <p>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>												

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	
	A. Know their rights (%)	96	94	92	-2.00%	
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	96	94	92	-2.00%	
	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	95	92	92	-3.00%	
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data. The State met all of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.					
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 1.7%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 1.3%.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 3.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 3.0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 2.8%.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [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 94%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 64 of 65 findings of noncompliance identified in</p>					<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>November 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the one uncorrected FFY 2007 finding of noncompliance.</p> <p>As noted above, the 45-day timeline requirements of this indicator are the subject of the Compliance Agreement. OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010 and in its final progress report data demonstrating that the remaining five counties the State identified as being in noncompliance in November 2007 were corrected. The State provided all of the required information with its final progress report. OSEP responded to the State's final progress report and information in OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The 45-day timeline requirements of this indicator were the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP responded to the State's efforts to ensure compliance OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter and looks forward to the State's FFY 2009 data in the FFY 2011 APR. 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 one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each county with remaining noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and each county identified with noncompliance in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the county, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</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 98%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in its final progress report under the Compliance Agreement that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>As noted above, the IFSP transition content requirements of this indicator are the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. The State provided in its June 23, 2008 progress report a list of four counties found to be in noncompliance with the IFSP transition content requirements of this indicator. ODH reported in its final progress report that it issued findings and required CAPs for all counties found noncompliant with the timely transition conference requirements under this indicator. OSEP responded to the State's final progress report and information in OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p>	<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 IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). 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>The IFSP transition content requirements of this indicator were the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP responded to the State's efforts to ensure compliance in OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter, and looks forward to the State's FFY 2009 data in the FFY 2011 APR. 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>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009, that it has verified that each county with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (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 an IFSP with transition steps</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the county (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</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 87%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State did not provide information on any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator. The State reported that slippage under this indicator was primarily due to two counties not submitting documentation to LEAs in a timely manner. However, the State verified that the two EIS programs corrected their noncompliance prior to findings being issued.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). 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>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each county with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(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 provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the county (i.e., the child has exited the State's</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</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 89%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in its final progress report that all 24 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 under the Agreement for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>As noted above, the timely transition conference requirements of this indicator are the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, and in its progress reports under the Compliance Agreement data demonstrating compliance with the timely transition conference requirements of this indicator. The State provided in its June 23, 2008 progress report a list of 24 counties found to be in noncompliance with the timely transition conference requirements and provided updated data on correction in its February 2010 final progress report. OSEP responded to the State’s final progress report and information in OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). 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>The timely transition conference requirements of this indicator were the subject of the 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP responded to the State’s efforts to ensure compliance in OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter and looks forward to the State’s FFY 2009 data in the FFY 2011 APR. 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>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each county with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) (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 conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the county, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>9. 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 its improvement activities under this indicator and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 150 of 152 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the two uncorrected FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, and in its progress reports under the Compliance Agreement, updated correction data for all counties that the State identified as being in noncompliance in November 2008 as well as the status of correction for any other findings made through November 6, 2009. The State provided all of the required information in its February 26, 2010 final progress report . OSEP responded to the State's efforts to ensure compliance in OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008</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 IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The timely correction requirements of this indicator were the subject of the Compliance Agreement. OSEP responded to the State's efforts to ensure compliance in OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter and looks forward to the State's FFY 2009 data in the FFY 2011 APR. If the State does not report 100% compliance for this indicator 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 two findings</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each county 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 program, 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>Additionally, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, and 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data are based on the timely resolution of three of five complaints. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data 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</p>

Ohio Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR ResponseTable

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that two of four mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</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 2009 APR, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>