



OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017– June 30, 2018)

Submitted January 29, 2019

Introduction

Executive Summary

The reporting year ending June 30, 2018 was the end of the second year that the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD) served as the lead agency for Ohio's Part C Early Intervention program. DODD has continued its focus on delivery of high quality technical assistance and professional development opportunities to EI service providers to support the effective and appropriate implementation of Part C regulations and evidence-based EI practices. Much of the past year has been focused on drafting new rules for the EI program. DODD has welcomed and encouraged active stakeholder involvement. DODD relies heavily on the input of other state agencies, EI providers, and families to craft policies, trainings, and guidance that is clear and effective. In the upcoming reporting period, as DODD implements new rules, we will work with EI programs and stakeholders to reaffirm the requirements of IDEA and best EI practices.

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

In Ohio, general supervision is outlined in Ohio Administrative Code (OAC), 3701-8. More specifically, Ohio defines who can be an Early Intervention Service Coordination contractor in OAC 3701-8-02. The state's monitoring and enforcement of sanctions for these contractors are outlined in OAC 3701-8-02.1. All dispute resolution rights for parents and responsibilities of contractors are described in OAC 3701-8-10, 3701-8-10.1, and 3701-8-10.2. These rules communicate how the lead agency in Ohio requires local EI programs to practice and the sanctions that will be taken if noncompliance is identified.

In addition to these rules, Ohio utilizes its website, guidance documents, memos, conference calls, and newsletters to provide technical assistance around the requirements of IDEA Part C. EI program consultants also reiterate the rules through various communication methodologies including individual calls, e-mails, conference calls, webinars, on-site trainings and on-site focused technical assistance about the requirements. Topic-specific guidance on rules is also offered via web-based training modules. The lead agency monitors all EI programs annually on a rotating schedule through three compliance indicators: 45-Day timeline, Timely Receipt of Services, and Transition Planning Conference and Transition Steps and Services. Local Education Agency (LEA) notification is monitored for every program annually. Any EI program with less than 100% compliance on any of these indicators is issued a finding and provided with targeted technical assistance, as needed. Data for the program are monitored monthly until compliance is verified at 100%. Finally, all local EI programs have a technical assistance plan that addresses these priorities.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Six EI program consultants work at DODD and provide timely, high quality technical assistance to all 88 Ohio county EI programs. The program consultants work closely with the data and monitoring team to ensure that technical assistance is targeted to local program needs. Program consultants make site visits, engage in conference calls, and complete record reviews and other activities to support local programs' implementation of state and federal Part C regulations and best EI practices. All local programs have an active technical assistance and training plan drafted in concert with the assigned program consultant. This plan reflects local needs and strengths and serves as a roadmap for implementation of IDEA and evidence-based EI practices.

DODD continues to communicate via a formal update memo on a bi-weekly basis with the EI field to provide important updates and explanations about program requirements, due dates, and training opportunities. The memo is geared to local EI program leadership, but any interested person can sign up to receive the communication. As of October 2018, the communication has more than 1000 recipients. The communications are also archived on the EI program's website.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Ohio continued in this reporting period to make significant strides forward in the area of professional development. Not only did Ohio create and contract for a number of new trainings, but it continued to ensure that trainings were available in multiple formats. In the current reporting period, DODD and its contractors have produced trainings related to the opioid crisis, documentation, and authentic assessment. Additionally, DODD worked with content area experts in a variety of areas (nutrition, hearing, vision, etc.) to create a monthly series of virtual “brown bag-style” trainings. These content experts share information aimed at explaining typical development in a particular area, potential red flags, and available resources. This series has proved very popular with hundreds of professionals accessing the webinars each month.

DODD-created trainings are not created in a vacuum, as stakeholder input is sought throughout development. This involvement is not limited to discussions with our State Inter-Agency Coordinating Council (SICC), as our training protocol is to pilot DODD-created trainings with local stakeholders prior to broader release to the field. Any feedback from trainees’ is incorporated into updated versions of the trainings.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Stakeholders in Ohio are engaged in numerous ways, including calls, public postings inviting input and feedback, quarterly State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meetings, and requests for feedback before any significant program change is made.

The lead agency invites public comment on the APR, annual application for Part C IDEA funds, and any rule or form changes. The public is invited to provide comment for a minimum of thirty calendar days for any document submitted to the USDOE/OSEP. All documents are posted on the program website (<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/>) for a minimum of sixty calendar days.

EI program leadership meet frequently with EI stakeholder organizations and committees. EI program leadership attends regularly scheduled meetings of stakeholder groups related to county boards of developmental disabilities, the Developmental Disabilities Council, the Universal Newborn Hearing Sub-Committee, and Family and Children First Council, which is responsible for overseeing the work of service coordination at the local level in Ohio. In addition, EI program leadership takes part in numerous state cross-agency initiatives. At these meetings, EI program leadership provides updates relevant to the stakeholder group being addressed and seeks stakeholder input about the EI program.

Announcements and solicitations for feedback go out widely via the program’s bi-weekly communication and EI website to EI providers, parents, stakeholders, grantees, service providers, and county boards of developmental disabilities. There are currently more than 1000 persons subscribed to the EI bi-weekly communication. In addition to these electronic communication strategies, DODD engages numerous workgroups, including the SICC and a larger, more diverse EI Stakeholder group at quarterly in-person meetings to discuss any business in Early Intervention that needs input, feedback, or assistance. The state also has ad hoc calls with this group as needed.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

DODD provides the public with a report on each EIS program's performance on the APR indicators, as well as each program's determination category and a description of the method used to make determinations by posting the 88 EI program reports on the program website (<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/>) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY16 reports were added and an electronic copy of the reports was sent to all local EIS programs in January 2018. The FFY17 reports will be added to the website by June 2019.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		72.37%	96.80%	98.78%	94.06%	98.59%	98.71%	99.36%	96.11%	98.46%	99.05%	99.16%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data
1,091	1,106	98.64%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	113
--	-----

Describe your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Ohio defines timely receipt of early intervention services as services that are delivered for the first time within 30 days of the signed IFSP to which they are added.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period. DODD completes activities related to each of these one at a time on a rotating schedule throughout each year. As part of this process, findings are issued as soon as possible after noncompliance is identified (within three months of discovery).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2017. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between July 1, 2017 and September 30, 2017 were included in Ohio's FFY17 TRS analysis. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system as well as from the review and

verification of a selection of records to determine the percent compliant for this indicator. The 1,091 child records counted as being compliant include 113 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 113 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. A total of four findings were issued to four EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis. These findings were identified and issued in FFY17, so they will be due for correction in FFY18 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

There were no TRS findings due for correction in FFY17. Ohio reported four TRS findings in its FFY16 APR based on FFY16 data; however, these findings were identified and issued in FFY17, so they will be due for correction in FFY18 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	81.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Data	83.91%	86.47%	88.32%	90.24%	91.06%	83.33%	83.93%	80.70%	80.04%	86.29%	94.41%	98.14%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

At the August 13, 2014 SICC meeting, stakeholders proposed that we use the FFY 2012 data as the FFY 2013 target, given we were setting a target for activities which had already taken place. That methodology was applied to all performance indicators, with agreement that targets for this indicator should gradually rise to the maximum 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets were discussed at the August 2014 SICC meeting. A proposal was provided back to the SICC and the larger EI Stakeholder group in November 2014 at which time each indicator's proposed set of targets was discussed at an in-person meeting. Consensus was reached, with some edits from that discussion resulting in the targets posted for public comment within the APR on November 25, 2014. After the collection of public comment, no changes were needed or made to the targets agreed upon by the SICC and EI Stakeholders.

FFY 2017 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data
10,413	10,523	98.95%

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	FFY	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
A1	Target		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.10%	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
	Data	63.02%	60.44%	59.07%	55.33%	57.60%	58.06%	63.22%	57.97%	54.26%
A2	Target		60.00%	60.00%	61.70%	63.40%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
	Data	63.34%	62.10%	66.81%	66.65%	65.76%	62.57%	65.65%	67.17%	67.87%
B1	Target		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
	Data	62.85%	62.41%	59.27%	56.81%	58.33%	59.58%	62.16%	62.69%	62.08%
B2	Target		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%
	Data	62.93%	62.10%	66.89%	61.20%	60.43%	57.60%	59.96%	63.24%	62.68%
C1	Target		60.00%	60.00%	61.30%	62.60%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%
	Data	62.50%	60.98%	59.21%	62.58%	63.50%	63.48%	65.31%	62.78%	64.87%
C2	Target		60.00%	60.00%	62.00%	63.60%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%
	Data	63.49%	61.85%	67.57%	64.88%	64.28%	60.95%	63.71%	60.22%	60.16%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1	63.00%	64.00%
Target A2	70.00%	71.00%
Target B1	63.00%	64.00%
Target B2	64.00%	65.00%
Target C1	68.00%	69.00%
Target C2	68.00%	69.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

At the August 13, 2014 SICC meeting, stakeholders proposed that we use the FFY 2012 data as the FFY 2013 target, given we were setting a target for activities which had already taken place. That methodology was applied to all performance indicators, with agreement that targets for this indicator should gradually rise to the maximum 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets were discussed at the August 2014 SICC meeting. A proposal was provided back to the SICC and the larger EI Stakeholder group in November 2014 at which time each indicator's proposed set of targets was discussed at an in-person meeting. Consensus was reached, with some edits

from that discussion resulting in the targets posted for public comment within the APR on November 25, 2014. After the collection of public comment, no changes were needed or made to the targets agreed upon by the SICC and EI Stakeholders.

FFY 2017 Data

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	66	0.89%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,698	22.96%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	623	8.43%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,451	19.62%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,556	48.09%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,074	3,838	54.04%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	5,007	7,394	67.72%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	85	1.15%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,839	24.87%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	974	13.17%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,002	27.08%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,494	33.73%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,976	4,900	60.73%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,496	7,394	60.81%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	77	1.04%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,938	26.21%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,083	14.65%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,472	33.43%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,824	24.67%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,555	5,570	63.82%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,296	7,394	58.10%

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	10,922
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	3,441

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	FFY	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
A	Target	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	95.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	Data	94.53%	95.76%	93.76%	92.80%	86.36%	86.33%	93.22%	92.52%	93.13%	93.84%	94.42%
B	Target	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	99.00%
	Data	94.74%	96.07%	94.26%	95.02%	92.23%	91.91%	96.04%	94.38%	94.88%	95.17%	95.42%
C	Target ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%
	Data	93.39%	94.84%	91.81%	93.70%	91.15%	90.73%	95.27%	94.45%	94.67%	94.48%	94.50%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A	99.00%	100%
Target B	100%	100%
Target C	99.00%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

At the August 13, 2014 SICC meeting, stakeholders proposed that we use the FFY 2012 data as the FFY 2013 target, given we were setting a target for activities which had already taken place. That methodology was applied to all performance indicators, with agreement that targets for this indicator should gradually rise to the maximum 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets were discussed at the August 2014 SICC meeting. A proposal was provided back to the SICC and the larger EI Stakeholder group in November 2014 at which time each indicator's proposed set of targets was discussed at an in-person meeting. Consensus was reached, with some edits from that discussion resulting in the targets posted for public comment within the APR on November 25, 2014. After the collection of public comment, no changes were needed or made to the targets agreed upon by the SICC and EI Stakeholders.

FFY 2017 Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	# of Positive Responses	Total Respondents	Percent
4A. Know their rights	1,400	1,467	95.43%
4B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	1,409	1,469	95.92%
4C. Help their children develop and learn	1,393	1,468	94.89%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State. Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

The Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities used a modified version of the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) 2010 Family Outcomes Questionnaire. These items from the ECO Family Questionnaire were adapted for Ohio and used on a survey mailed to families in order to gather data for this indicator:

1. Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to know my rights in the program.
2. Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to communicate my child's needs.
3. Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to help my child learn and develop.

Each question had a five-point scale with the following anchors:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Ohio added total responses of 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' for each question to determine what percentage of families were helped by Help Me Grow EI in the three areas of this indicator.

The following modifications to the ECO survey were made:

- Help Me Grow Early Intervention was substituted for Part C throughout the questionnaire as that is how families "know" Part C in Ohio.
- The verbiage of the survey was changed to be at a 5th grade reading level.
- The adapted OSEP items (Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to know my rights in the program; Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to communicate my child's needs; and Help Me Grow Early Intervention has helped me to help my child learn and develop) were the first questions on the questionnaire rather than dispersed throughout the survey as they are on the 2010 OSEP version of the questionnaire.
- DODD added additional open-ended questions for use in Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan and to conduct a more in depth qualitative analysis of the survey data.

Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on June 1, 2018 were identified as potential recipients. DODD mailed the surveys to families early August 2018 and surveys were due back by October 15, 2018. In an effort to maximize the number of survey respondents, Ohio implemented the following strategies in its administration of the family questionnaire:

- DODD notified county agencies of survey recipients so they could encourage families to respond.
- As was done in previous years, the sample of families surveyed was increased by utilizing a sampling date close to the survey distribution, as well as by including families who had exited the program in the population of potential survey recipients.
- The survey was translated into Spanish and distributed to families whose primary caregiver was identified as primarily Spanish-speaking in Ohio's Part C program's data system (EIDS).
- Families were provided the option to respond to the questionnaire via mailing back to DODD or by completing online in either English or Spanish.
- Families were given an extended period of time to respond to the survey (approximately 8 weeks).
- After distribution, the questionnaire was discussed at a statewide meeting of EI providers and highlighted in the Part C Coordinator's bi-weekly communication to Ohio's EI field.

Questionnaire Response

Of 10,281 families who were identified as having children being served on June 1, 2018, a total of 9,976 received questionnaires (with those not receiving questionnaires being due to a deceased child or not having up-to-date address information for the family in the data system). DODD received 1,472 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 14.76%. Eighty-six of Ohio's eighty-eight counties were represented in the responses to the Family Questionnaire. The following table outlines the methods families used to respond to the questionnaire:

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents' Response Type

Response Method	Number	Percent
Mail	1,094	74%
Web	378	26%
Total	1,472	100%

Respondent Representativeness

The following tables provide a comparison of the race/ethnicity categories, age ranges, and gender between the respondents and non-respondents of the questionnaire, as well as the totals for all children served in EI in Ohio on June 1, 2018.

Note: The total of 10,808 in the "Total" columns in the tables below include the number of *children* served on June 1, 2018 in Ohio. The 10,281 families referenced earlier represents the number of families with children served on June 1, 2018, and encompasses all of these children. The 9,976 families who received the questionnaire are encompassed in the table below in the "Non-Respondents" and "Respondents" columns.

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Comparison

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	7	0.08%	1	0.07%	10	0.09%
Asian	201	2.36%	27	1.83%	252	2.33%
Black	1,279	15.04%	83	5.64%	1,521	14.07%
Hispanic	578	6.80%	56	3.80%	674	6.24%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	13	0.15%	3	0.20%	16	0.15%
Two or More Races	397	4.67%	53	3.60%	488	4.52%
White	6,029	70.90%	1,249	84.85%	7,847	72.60%
Total	8,504	100.00%	1,472	100.00%	10,808	100.00%

Table 3: Child Age Range

Age Range	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 to 1	979	11.51%	184	12.50%	1,332	12.32%
1 to 2	2,646	31.11%	448	30.43%	3,383	31.30%
2 to 3	4,879	57.37%	840	57.07%	6,093	56.37%
Total	8,504	100.00%	1,472	100.00%	10,808	100.00%

Table 4: Gender

Gender	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	3,206	37.70%	498	33.83%	4,056	37.53%
Male	5,298	62.30%	974	66.17%	6,752	62.47%
Total	8,504	100.00%	1,472	100.00%	10,808	100.00%

In regard to race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, but White families were overrepresented and Black families were underrepresented among respondents. Age categories of children in respondent families were comparable to non-respondents and all children served on June 1, 2018. Respondent families with male children were slightly over-represented and with female children were slightly under-represented, as compared to non-respondents as well as all children served on June 1. Primarily through the state's bi-weekly EI Program updates, Ohio communicated with local programs more frequently than in past years regarding encouraging family participation in the questionnaire with the goal of increasing responses overall, as well as increasing representativeness across race and ethnicity. Ohio has also formed a workgroup regarding its Family Questionnaire, to discuss distribution methods and local program participation in distributing questionnaires and collecting results, with a particular focus on increasing representativeness across race and ethnicity categories.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%	1.60%	1.20%	1.20%	1.30%	1.30%
Data	1.38%	1.43%	1.66%	1.75%	1.75%	1.86%	1.76%	1.19%	1.03%	1.01%	0.97%	0.96%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	1.40%	1.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

At the August 13, 2014 SICC meeting, stakeholders proposed that we use the FFY 2012 data as the FFY 2013 target, given we were setting a target for activities which had already taken place. That methodology was applied to all performance indicators, with agreement that targets for this indicator should gradually rise to the maximum 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets were discussed at the August 2014 SICC meeting. A proposal was provided back to the SICC and the larger EI Stakeholder group in November 2014 at which time each indicator's proposed set of targets was discussed at an in-person meeting. Consensus was reached, with some edits from that discussion resulting in the targets posted for public comment within the APR on November 25, 2014. After the collection of public comment, no changes were needed or made to the targets agreed upon by the SICC and EI Stakeholders.

FFY 2017 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data
1,259	136,705	0.92%

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		2.40%	2.60%	2.80%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	3.10%	2.70%	2.70%	2.80%	2.80%
Data	2.50%	2.64%	2.97%	3.29%	3.21%	3.49%	3.36%	2.70%	2.49%	2.46%	2.45%	2.45%

FFY 2017 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	2.90%	2.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

At the August 13, 2014 SICC meeting, stakeholders proposed that we use the FFY 2012 data as the FFY 2013 target, given we were setting a target for activities which had already taken place. That methodology was applied to all performance indicators, with agreement that targets for this indicator should gradually rise to the maximum 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets were discussed at the August 2014 SICC meeting. A proposal was provided back to the SICC and the larger EI Stakeholder group in November 2014 at which time each indicator's proposed set of targets was discussed at an in-person meeting. Consensus was reached, with some edits from that discussion resulting in the targets posted for public comment within the APR on November 25, 2014. After the collection of public comment, no changes were needed or made to the targets agreed upon by the SICC and EI Stakeholders.

FFY 2017 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data
10,523	416,395	2.53%

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	N/A	73.80%	94.42%	93.79%	97.52%	98.67%	99.09%	95.15%	95.96%	97.86%	95.06%	97.23%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data
1,188	1,200	99.00%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	400
--	-----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period. DODD completes activities related to each of these one at a time on a rotating schedule throughout each year. As part of this process, findings are issued as soon as possible after noncompliance is identified (within three months of discovery).

Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2017. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had 45-Day timelines ending between April 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018 were included in Ohio's FFY17 45-Day analysis. Of the 1,200 child records examined, 1,188 (99.00 percent) were compliant. A total of three findings were issued to three EIS programs

upon completion of the baseline analysis. These findings were identified and issued in FFY18 and therefore they are due for correction in FFY19 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY19 APR.

The 1,200 child records counted as being compliant include 400 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 400 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

Fourteen findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY17, eight of which were based on FFY15 data and reported in the FFY15 APR and six of which were based on FFY16 data and reported in the FFY16 APR, but all of which were identified and issued in FFY16. All fourteen findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each local program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Fourteen findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY17, eight of which were based on FFY15 data (reported in the FFY15 APR) and six of which were based on FFY16 data (reported in the FFY16 APR), but all of which were identified and issued in FFY16. All fourteen findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

The EIS programs found to be noncompliant with 45-Day Timelines were issued a finding of noncompliance via a written memorandum that included the noncompliant status and informed the local program that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The memos were issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified (within three months of discovery).

To ensure local programs are correctly implementing each regulatory requirement, Ohio requests records for verification of correction as follows:

- DODD examines data on a monthly basis to determine local program compliance. Data are pulled on or just after the first of each month and local programs receive missing data inquiries, as necessary.
- In order to correct any findings, local programs must first have two consecutive months of data at 100% face value, at which point DODD requests a representative sample of records for verification.
- If a local program does not correct within six monthly data analyses, the local program will go on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

- If a local program has no applicable records during one of the first six months of analyses, the month will still count towards the six months. A month with no applicable records, however, will not impact two consecutive months that occur immediately prior to and following the null month.

The state verified a randomly selected, representative sample of child records from the local programs to ensure that for each child, the required components were completed within 45 days or that any delays in this timeline were due to family reasons. The state continued to examine data and request records to verify until all 45-Day requirements were found to be met for all children as determined by requested child records. In all cases, the needed sample size was calculated using an online sample size calculator with a 95% confidence level and 15% confidence interval. Specifically, verification to indicate correction occurred in the local program as follows:

FFY15 Data

- **Champaign:** 10 records verified; 45-day timelines ending in July and August 2016
- **Columbiana:** 10 records verified; 45-day timelines ending in September and October 2016
- **Mercer:** 5 records verified; 45-day timelines ending in July and August 2016
- **Muskingum:** 11 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending September and October 2016
- **Perry:** 6 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in August and September 2016
- **Ross:** 7 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in August and September 2016
- **Stark:** 20 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in July and August 2016
- **Union:** 11 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending October and November 2016

FFY16 Data

- **Henry:** 9 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 2017
- **Holmes:** 7 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 2017
- **Logan:** 4 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in April and May 2017
- **Medina:** 16 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in April and May 2017
- **Portage:** 15 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 2017
- **Vinton:** 2 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in July and August 2017

Describe how the State verified that each local program corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Ohio ensured each local program corrected the individual case of noncompliance through the state's baseline analyses. An explanation of noncompliance (referred to as a noncompliance reason or "NCR" in Ohio) is required upon late completion of any required components. Thus, in the bulk of cases of late completion, the state automatically ensures required actions have been completed when determining baseline compliance percentages. In addition, the state, as part of its baseline analyses, determined if any child for whom a required component was late had exited or moved from the EIS program's jurisdiction. For this indicator, Ohio ensured that all 45-day requirements were completed, albeit late, or that the child was subsequently exited from EI.

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

8A Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.03%	98.76%	97.50%	97.64%	99.22%	99.31%	100%	98.70%	98.17%	98.53%	99.04%

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

8A FFY 2017 Data

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data
288	303	95.05%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	2
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period. DODD completes activities related to each of these one at a time on a rotating schedule throughout each year. As part of this process, findings are issued as soon as possible after noncompliance is identified (within three months of discovery).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2017. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. A sample of children from each of the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between October 1, 2017 and December 31, 2017 were included in Ohio's FFY17 Transition Steps and Services analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which a representative sample of children with TPCs due between January 1, 2018 and March 31, 2018 were examined). Of the 303 child records examined, 288 (95.05 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were identified and issued in FFY18 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY19 APR.

The 288 child records counted as being compliant include 2 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 2 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

Two Steps and Services findings were due for correction in FFY17. These findings were included in the FFY15 APR as they based on FFY15 data, but not identified and issued until FFY16. The findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that the EIS program (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 EIS program. There were also two findings reported in Ohio's FFY16 APR, but they were issued in FFY17 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

8A Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each local program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Two findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY17, which were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

The EIS programs found to be noncompliant with Transition Steps and Services were issued a finding of noncompliance via a written memorandum that included the noncompliant status and informed the local program that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The memos were issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified (within three months of discovery).

To ensure local programs are correctly implementing each regulatory requirement, Ohio requests records for verification of correction as follows:

- DODD examines data on a monthly basis to determine local program compliance. Data are pulled on or just after the first of each month and local programs receive missing data inquiries, as necessary.

- In order to correct any findings, local programs must first have two consecutive months of data at 100% face value, at which point DODD requests a representative sample of records for verification.
- If a local program does not correct within six monthly data analyses, the local program will go on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).
- If a local program has no applicable records during one of the first six months of analyses, the month will still count towards the six months. A month with no applicable records, however, will not impact two consecutive months that occur immediately prior to and following the null month.

The state verified a randomly selected, representative sample of child records from the local program to ensure that for each child, an IFSP included Transition Steps and Services or that any delays in this timeline were due to family reasons. The state continued to examine data and request records to verify until all Transition Steps and Services were found to be met for all children as determined by requested child records. In all cases, the needed sample size was calculated using an online sample size calculator with a 95% confidence level and 15% confidence interval. Specifically, verification to indicate correction occurred in the local program as follows:

- **Mahoning:** 7 records verified; TPCs due in October and November 2016
- **Richland:** 7 records verified; TPCs due in October and November 2016

Describe how the State verified that each local program corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Ohio ensured each local program corrected the individual case of noncompliance through the state's baseline analyses. An explanation of noncompliance (referred to as a noncompliance reason or "NCR" in Ohio) is required upon late completion of all required components. Thus, in the bulk of cases of late completion, the state automatically ensures required actions have been completed when determining baseline compliance percentages. In addition, the state, as part of its baseline analyses, determined if any child for whom a required component was late had exited or moved from the EIS program's jurisdiction. For this indicator, Ohio ensured that for all children potentially eligible for Part B, an IFSP contained Transition Steps and Services, albeit late, or that the child was subsequently exited from EI.

8B Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	97.48%	90.22%	86.92%	97.40%	93.10%	97.82%	NVR	NVR	0%	100%	99.61%

FFY 2017- FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

8B FFY 2017 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data
5,230	5,230	100%

Describe the method used to collect these data

Ohio EIS programs are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA by February 1st; May 1st; August 1st; and November 1st each year, that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. Although the report due dates do not correspond to a state or federal fiscal year, because each report includes all children who will be turning three within a year of the report due date, the state ensures that, over the course of the four report submissions, LEAs are notified of children potentially eligible for Part B at least 90 days prior to any child's third birthday. The state requires EIS programs to submit proof to DODD that they submitted the February 1 report to the relevant LEAs, which, for the past several years, has been used to determine compliance for this indicator. As part of this process, findings are issued as soon as possible after noncompliance is identified (within three months of discovery).

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from EIS programs. Reports due February 1, 2018 were generated using Ohio's statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2018 and January 31, 2019 who were potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (534 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). The LEAs were informed in a timely manner for all 5,230 (100%) toddlers turning three in the referenced time frame and whose families did not opt out of notification. DODD ensured the SEA was notified of all 5,230 children for the February 1, 2018 reporting date in a timely manner, as well as for each quarterly reporting date throughout the fiscal year. As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of the data from one of the required quarterly reports within the fiscal year is presumed to represent the state and counties' compliance for the entire fiscal year. No LEA/SEA findings were issued based on FFY17 data.

One LEA/SEA finding was due for correction in FFY17. This finding was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**State monitoring**

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from local Help Me Grow EI programs. Reports due February 1, 2018 were generated using Ohio's statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2018 and January 31, 2019 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (534 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). Currently, counties are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA (due February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st each year) that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. Counties are then required to submit proof of doing so to DODD for the February 1 report, which is used for the APR compliance analysis. The LEAs were informed in a timely manner for all 5,230 (100%) toddlers turning three in the referenced time frame and whose families did not opt out of notification. DODD ensured the SEA was notified of all 5,230 children for the February 1, 2018 reporting date in a timely manner, as well as for each quarterly reporting date throughout the fiscal year. As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of the data from one of the required quarterly reports within the fiscal year is presumed to represent the counties' compliance for the entire fiscal year.

8B Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each local program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

One finding for this indicator was due for correction in FFY17, which was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

The EIS program found to be noncompliant with Notification to the LEA was issued a finding of noncompliance via a written memorandum that included the noncompliant status and informed the local program that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. This memo was issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified (within three months of discovery).

Ohio EIS programs are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA by February 1; May 1; August 1; and November 1 each year, that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. While local programs are typically only required to submit proof of LEA notification for the February 1 notification, when found to be noncompliant, local programs are required to submit proof of each quarterly report until they show they successfully notified all of the LEAs in their county of children potentially eligible for Part B in a timely manner. Specifically, verification to indicate correction occurred in the local program as follows:

- **Union:** 31 records verified via submission of the May 1 2017 LEA report which included children potentially eligible for Part B who were turning three between May 1, 2017 and April 30, 2018

Describe how the State verified that each local program corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Ohio ensured each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through its baseline process, as the local program that received a finding submitted proof of notifying all LEAs of children potentially eligible for Part B, but sent the notification to some of the LEAs after the deadline for doing so.

8C Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			89.32%	94.37%	97.64%	97.78%	99.32%	99.04%	96.47%	98.90%	99.65%	98.09%

FFY 2017 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

8C FFY 2017 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data
610	626	97.44%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	73
--	----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period. DODD completes activities related to each of these one at a time on a rotating schedule throughout each year. As part of this process, findings are issued as soon as possible after noncompliance is identified (within three months of discovery).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2017. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between October 1, 2017 and December 31, 2017 were included in Ohio’s FFY17 Transition Planning Conference analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which a representative sample of children with TPCs due between January 1, 2018 and March 31, 2018 were examined). Of the 626 child records examined, 610 (97.44 percent) were compliant. A total of one finding was issued to one EIS program upon completion of the baseline analysis; this finding was identified and issued in FFY18 and therefore the status of its correction will be reported in the FFY19 APR.

The 610 child records counted as being compliant include 73 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 73 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were two TPC findings due for correction in FFY17. These findings were included in the FFY15 APR as they were based on FFY15 data, but not identified and issued until FFY16. These findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program. There

were an additional two findings reported in Ohio's FFY16 APR, but they were issued in FFY17 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Two findings for this indicator was due for correction in FFY17, which were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (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 EIS program.

The EIS programs found to be noncompliant with Timely Transition Planning Conferences were issued a finding of noncompliance via a written memorandum that included the noncompliant status and informed the local programs that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The memos were issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified (within three months of discovery).

To ensure local programs are correctly implementing each regulatory requirement, Ohio requests records for verification of correction as follows:

- DODD examines data on a monthly basis to determine local program compliance. Data are pulled on or just after the first of each month and local programs receive missing data inquiries, as necessary.
- In order to correct any findings, local programs must first have two consecutive months of data at 100% face value, at which point DODD requests a representative sample of records for verification.
- If a local program does not correct within six monthly data analyses, the local program will go on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).
- If a local program has no applicable records during one of the first six months of analyses, the month will still count towards the six months. A month with no applicable records, however, will not impact two consecutive months that occur immediately prior to and following the null month.

The state verified a randomly selected, representative sample of child records from the local program to ensure that Timely Transition Planning Conferences occurred for each child. The state continued to examine data and request records to verify until all TPC requirements were found to be met for all children as determined by requested child records. In all cases, the needed sample size was calculated using an online sample size calculator with a 95% confidence level and 15% confidence interval. Specifically, verification to indicate correction occurred in the local program as follows:

- Pickaway: 2 records verified; TPC due dates in November and December 2016
- Richland: 10 records verified; TPCs due in December 2016 and January 2017

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Ohio ensured each local program corrected the individual case of noncompliance through the state's baseline analyses. An explanation of noncompliance (referred to as a noncompliance reason or "NCR" in Ohio) is required upon late completion of all required components. Thus, in the bulk of cases of late completion, the state automatically ensures required actions have been completed when determining baseline compliance percentages. In addition, the state, as part of its baseline analyses, determined if any child for whom a required component was late had exited or moved from the EIS program's jurisdiction. For this indicator, Ohio ensured that TPCs were held for all children potentially eligible for Part B, albeit late, or that the child was subsequently exited from EI.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2017 Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	N/A

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	93.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	100%	100%	100%	50.00%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2017 Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	0	N/A