

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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 IDEA Part C regulations cited in this APR Response Table as 34 CFR §303.xxx are those regulations which were in effect during FFY 2010. If the State has chosen to implement any of the new regulations published in 76 Federal Register 60140 (September 28, 2011) prior to the required implementation date of July 1, 2012 for a regulation that impacts the measurements for an SPP/ APR indicator, the State must so indicate in its FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. However, OSEP cannot determine whether those two FFY 2009 findings were corrected under this indicator.</p> <p>The State also reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the data the State reported for this indicator. 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining two noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that OSEP could not</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>determine as corrected: (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 EIS program, 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>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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. However, the State's FFY 2010 data under IDEA section 618 for this indicator are 92%, and the State explained the discrepancy. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 91%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 82%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>												
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="573 1198 1585 1502"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="573 1198 972 1295"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="972 1198 1176 1295"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1176 1198 1379 1295"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1379 1198 1585 1295"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1295 972 1433"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="972 1295 1176 1433">60.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1176 1295 1379 1433">59.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1379 1295 1585 1433">60</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1433 972 1502"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="972 1433 1176 1502">62.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1176 1433 1379 1502">59.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1379 1433 1585 1502">60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.4	59.1	60	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	62.4	59.3	60	<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. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.4	59.1	60											
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	62.4	59.3	60											

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)																								
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	60.1	59.2	60																					
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																					
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	62.1	66.8	60																					
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.1	66.9	60																					
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	61.8	67.6	60																					
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.																								
<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; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="575 1068 1583 1446"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> <th><b><u>Progress</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Know their rights (%)</td> <td>93</td> <td>86.3</td> <td>93</td> <td>-6.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td>95</td> <td>92.2</td> <td>93</td> <td>-2.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td>94</td> <td>91.1</td> <td>93</td> <td>-2.90%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its</p>					<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b><u>Progress</u></b>	A. Know their rights (%)	93	86.3	93	-6.70%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	95	92.2	93	-2.80%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	94	91.1	93	-2.90%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b><u>Progress</u></b>																					
A. Know their rights (%)	93	86.3	93	-6.70%																					
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	95	92.2	93	-2.80%																					
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	94	91.1	93	-2.90%																					

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>
	FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.	
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 1.75%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 1.5%.</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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 3.0%.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. However, OSEP's June 20, 2011 Response Table required that, when reporting on the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and the EIS program with the one remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008: (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 EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not report under this indicator that it met these requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</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 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the data the State reported for this indicator. 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the eight findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and the FFY 2009 noncompliance the State reported as corrected under this indicator: (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 EIS program, 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>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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator.</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 IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h)</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p>	<p>and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) and (d)(8). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the data the State reported for this indicator. 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) and (d)(8) (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 and services for</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), 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>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's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 93.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>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 EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), 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>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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.8%. The State's FFY 2009 data were 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 of 20 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</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 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining five uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by 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 EIS program, 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%</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 34 of 44 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that eight findings were subsequently corrected by April 12, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the four outstanding findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not reported as corrected 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 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and the remaining two FFY 2009 findings in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>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 EIS program, 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. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2011 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are, as of January 31, 2012, 100%. These data are based on two complaints. 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 §303.512.</p>
<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, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

**Ohio Part C FFY 2010 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>resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.3%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.37%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%. The State did not, as required by the Indicator Measurement Table, submit a copy of the Indicator C14 Data Rubric.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>