

**Table A Ohio Part B**  
**Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

<b>SPP Indicator</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Required Action</b>
<p><b>Indicator 4:</b>  Rates of suspension and expulsion:  A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and  B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.  (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p><u>Other</u>  The State did not provide a plan for new indicator 4B describing how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the APR due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 8:</b>  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.  (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p><u>Other</u>  OSEP could not determine if the State plans to use sampling in collecting data for this indicator. If so, it is important that the State have a technically sound sampling plan to ensure that data used for entry, baseline, or to report on progress are valid and reliable. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>If the State intends to collect information through sampling, your SPP must include sampling methodology to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data on which to base your targets and improvement activities. The State must submit the revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR that is due February 1, 2007. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 14:</b></p> <p>Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Other</u></p> <p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for indicator 14 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology, with its FFY 2005 APR, that describes how data were collected. In the FFY 2005 APR, you must explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 16:</b></p> <p>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>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>The State reported a 98.6% level of compliance for indicator 16 in the SPP, specifically, the requirement at 34 CFR §300.661. While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 17:</b></p> <p>Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>The State reported a 92% level of compliance for indicator 17 in the SPP, specifically, the requirement at 34 CFR §300.511. While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p>