

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83.7%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 83.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 15.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 16.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 13.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 30%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 27.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 44%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 97.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 51.6% for reading and 45.4% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 48.6% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 39.9% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 57% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 47% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the calculation for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts this revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data are 3.6% for suspensions and .1% for expulsions. The suspension data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 6.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 5.92% for suspensions and .8% for expulsions.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR documentation regarding the completion of the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. The State reported that LEAs with significant discrepancies completed a self review of policies, procedures and practices and the State did not make any findings in regards to this indicator in either FFY 2005 or in FFY 2006.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		<p>examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 976 1444 1354"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>49.98%</td> <td>48.1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>14.86%</td> <td>13.83%</td> <td>13.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>4.74%</td> <td>4.09%</td> <td>6.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5 B and C and slippage for 5A.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.6%	49.98%	48.1 %	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.86%	13.83%	13.3%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.74%	4.09%	6.1%	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.6%	49.98%	48.1 %															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.86%	13.83%	13.3%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.74%	4.09%	6.1%															

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>The State provided summary assessment results for children in ODE-funded early learning programs, rather than progress data that would allow an assessment of how children enrolled in these programs improved while in the program. Therefore, the State did not provide valid and reliable data because its data did not reflect the measurement for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit progress data and improvement activities. The State submitted summary assessment data and improvement activities. The State's data are not valid and reliable. The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable progress data beginning in FFY 2007. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 90.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 90%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR the following</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State’s calculation of the data.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, 2. A description of how the State made that determination, 3. Data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and 4. A description of how the State made that determination. <p>The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State’s calculation of the data.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). 2. data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 82.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 93.8%. However, the State indicated that it had moved from collecting the data through monitoring to, for FFY 2006, collecting census data.</p> <p>The State met did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data reported in the FFY 2006 APR were collected through a telephone/fax survey and that follow-up contacts with LEA staff indicated confusion with the reporting procedures. Subsequent monitoring visits in 2006-2007 to verify the 2005-2006 data resulted in identified noncompliance in four LEAs. The State indicated that it would report on this noncompliance in the FFY 2007 APR.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 79.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 107 of 109 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining two districts with noncompliance would be required to use IDEA funds to address staff shortages and improve the transition process, if applicable. In the State's</p>	<p>OSEP's July 2, 2007 grant award letter required the State to provide two Progress Reports due February 1, 2008, and June 1, 2008. The State was required to submit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A. The number of Part B eligible children who transitioned from Part C to Part B from July 1, 2007 to the reporting date. B. Of those children, the number and percentage who had an IEP developed

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>special conditions report of January 31, 2008, the State further reported that these two districts had compliance rates of 77 and 85.7 percent, respectively, and that both would receive individualized technical assistance and on-going follow-up and monitoring from an OEL&SR consultant beginning in February, 2008.</p>	<p>and implemented by their third birthday.</p> <p>2. For the districts that were reviewed between January 1, 2007 and April 30, 2007:</p> <p>A. The number that are in compliance by the reporting date.</p> <p>B. For each district in the remainder (2 minus 2.A), a description of the specific enforcement actions that the State has taken to ensure compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124(b) and 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(9). The State also must describe the results of the State’s analysis of factors that have contributed to any continuing noncompliance, and the strategies that the State has implemented to address those factors.</p> <p>The State provided this information for the February 1, 2008 required Progress Report. The State’s second Progress Report was due June 1, 2008, and will be addressed in the State’s grant award letter.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR, data on the number of children referred and found not eligible. The data was provided by the State.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected (107 of 109 LEAs with identified noncompliance had corrected noncompliance) and that the remaining noncompliance from FFY 2004</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>was corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.3%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 29.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through focused monitoring were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR, complete and accurate FFY 2005 baseline data, as well as FFY 2006 data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. Both sets of data were provided by the State.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting on correction of the noncompliance identified in</p>

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps						
<p>14. 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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 495 1419 683"> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td>35.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td>23.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td>19.1%</td> </tr> </table>	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	35.8%	Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	23.0%	Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	19.1%	<p>the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	35.8%							
Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	23.0%							
Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	19.1%							
<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 this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR disaggregated data by indicator regarding the status of noncompliance and whether it was corrected in a timely manner. The State provided disaggregated data in its APR submission.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 16, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified 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</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data</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 2007 APR, due February 1,</p>						

Ohio Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 50.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 68.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 83.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 87%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 94.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>