

Ohio Early Intervention Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022– June 30, 2023)

Introduction

Executive Summary

This reporting year, much of Ohio's EI work focused on updating its program rules (due for the state's required five year review) to be implemented July 1, 2024; reviewing and updating the program's processes and protocols to ensure consistency with OSEP's general supervision expectations; and implementing strategies and initiatives to address the statewide provider shortage. While these undertakings were a primary focus, DODD continued to prioritize engaging and soliciting feedback from a broad array of stakeholders; analyzing and utilizing data to make data-informed decisions; implementing effective monitoring to identify program needs; and delivering high-quality technical assistance and professional development opportunities to Early Intervention (EI) service providers to address identified needs and support the effective and appropriate implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C regulations and evidence-based EI practices.

DODD continues to communicate primarily via a formal update memo on a bi-weekly basis with the EI field and stakeholders to provide important updates and explanations about program requirements, due dates, TA and training opportunities, monitoring and general supervision information, and data, including the Early Intervention Data System (EIDS). The memo is geared to local EI program leadership, but any interested person can sign up to receive the communication. Approximately 7200 individuals are on the distribution list. The communications are also archived on the EI program's website.

Additional Information Related to Data Collection and Reporting

DODD has no additional relevant information to report related to data collection and reporting.

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions)

In Ohio, the requirements for EI providers are outlined in Ohio Administrative Code at 5123-10-01 (Early Intervention Services - Procedural Safeguards); 5123-10-02, Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C (Early Intervention Eligibility and Services); 5123-10-03 (Early Intervention Services - System of Payments); and 5123-10-04 (Credentials for EI Service Coordinators and EI Service Coordination Supervisors). These rules apply to any EI service provider or other entity responsible for carrying out a requirement of Part C EI in Ohio, and DODD is directly responsible for overseeing the implementation of these rules.

In addition to these rules, Ohio utilizes its website, guidance documents, memos, webinars, and newsletters to provide technical assistance around the requirements of Part C of IDEA. Regional 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 Ohio EI Data and Monitoring team leads all the state's EI monitoring and general supervision efforts, including the identification and verification of correction of noncompliance. Members of the data and monitoring team examine trends in data related to compliance indicators, IDEA requirements, and evidence-based EI practices. They lead monitoring site visits, conduct record reviews, and provide support to local EI programs in implementing the

requirements of IDEA. Additional, more specific details, about Ohio’s general supervision and monitoring protocols are provided in the subsequent paragraphs.

The lead agency monitors all 88 local EI programs annually on one of three compliance indicators: 45-Day timeline; Timely Receipt of Services; and Transition, including Transition Planning Conference and Transition Steps and Services. The state utilizes a cyclical approach so each local program is monitored on each of these indicators within a three-year timeframe. Each year, 30 local programs are included as part of two of the analyses and 28 as part of the third. All data in the applicable timeframe are extracted from the Early Intervention Data System (EIDS), which is a live system where local EI programs are required to enter compliance and performance data. As part of these analyses, at least one child record is also requested from each local program to verify compliance, with a representative sample of records being reviewed/verified for a selection of local programs in each group. Both data from EIDS and from the verification of records are incorporated into the final analyses to determine percent compliance for each local program. Local Educational Agency (LEA) notification is monitored for every program annually. 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 does not opt out of sharing information. The state requires EIS programs to submit proof to DODD that they provided the February 1 report to the relevant LEAs, which, for the past several years, has been used to determine compliance for this indicator.

While the monitoring processes involved with the compliance indicators are thorough, the lead agency completes additional monitoring and general supervision, as needed, to ensure all IDEA Part C requirements are being met. The state utilizes a “no wrong door approach” and thus identifies potential noncompliance through a variety of means (e.g., via TA conversations, data system requests, System of Payments (SOP)/Payor of Last Resort (POLR) submissions, or fiscal monitoring). DODD thoroughly investigates any credible report of potential noncompliance, from individual child-level noncompliance to systemic noncompliance within a local program. After information is gathered, the state takes action, as applicable, to address any noncompliance. If noncompliance is identified, the state issues a finding or verifies that the noncompliance has been corrected prior to issuing the finding. All findings are issued as soon as possible, generally within three months of the State exercising due diligence regarding the area of concern and coming to a conclusion that the local program or provider has violated an IDEA requirement and did not correct the noncompliance prior to the state issuing a finding. Finally, every local EI program has a technical assistance and training plan that addresses any findings and other identified issues or priorities.

When a finding is issued, state EI consultants provide the local program with technical assistance, as needed. Data for the program are extracted from EIDS monthly and assessed for compliance, and a random sample of records is requested and reviewed until compliance is verified at 100%, at which time a correction memo is issued. In situations where an extremely small program does not have sufficient, updated data to demonstrate systemic compliance, alternative methods of verification of correction may be considered, taking into consideration factors such as county size, number of children served, extenuating circumstances, etc. Alternative methods to verify correction may include, but are not limited to, documentation of new policies and procedures, successful completion of professional development, and evidence of applicable system changes (e.g., changes in key personnel). Further, the state ensures any individual case of noncompliance identified through any means is corrected or that the child has exited from the specific local program.

This reporting year, DODD also created a work group specifically focused on General Supervision and the state EI program’s monitoring protocols. This group is thoroughly reviewing OSEP’s Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities under Parts B and C of IDEA and comparing the guidance to the state’s monitoring processes and protocols, with the intention of completing this review and identifying all potential needs related to general supervision by the end of the fiscal year. The lead agency has already begun making additions and adjustments to its monitoring processes and protocols and will continue to pursue quality improvement strategies as targeted areas are identified.

As required, Ohio issues local program determinations annually to each of the state’s 88 local programs. Determinations are based on both compliance and performance data. If applicable, the state takes additional factors, such as data

quality, longstanding noncompliance, or the identification of substantial systemic issues, into consideration. The lead agency sends each local program a determination memo that includes their county's determination as well as an explanation of how the state made local program determinations. The state also compiles local program results for APR indicators 1 through 8 and, along with the determination memos, sends each local program a report that includes their results on these indicators, the state results on these indicators, their local program determination, and a description of all the data included in the report. The memos are not posted publicly, but the reports are available on the Ohio EI website here:

<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/county-data>

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.

Five regional EI program consultants and a technical assistance team lead 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, in collaboration with other lead agency staff members, make onsite visits and hold virtual 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 strengths and needs and serves as a roadmap for implementation of IDEA and evidence-based EI practices.

During this reporting period, the EI program consultants continued to provide extensive support to local programs to ensure their eligibility processes were accurate and efficient. Many local program TA and Training plans also included a focus on the Child Outcome Summary (COS), especially on team collaboration (including the parent) to develop high quality COS narratives; IFSP outcomes, including accessing training on outcome development; and/or local outreach to increase EI referrals that ultimately lead to IFSP development. Additionally, EI program consultants continued to provide support around ARPA funding, which focused on oversight, evidence-based EI, and/or technology. Finally, the TA team placed emphasis on ensuring local programs have access to EI services and that service options are consistent across the state.

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.

In this reporting period, Ohio continued to provide a significant number of trainings to Ohio's EI field and engaged in several other Professional Development activities, as described subsequently. DODD collaborated with the state's Central Intake and Referral vendor to establish an early childhood job vacancies portal where prospective EI and Home Visiting personnel can view and apply for positions. The state also developed supplemental pathways for EISC credentialing in order to widen the pool of candidates as local programs continue to serve an increasing number of children. Additionally, DODD expanded its agreement with Early Childhood Mental Health (ECMH) Consultants and regional councils of government (COGs) to provide Part C evaluation and assessment services. The state also upgraded the Ohio Professional Registry (OPR) to collect hourly wage data, on a voluntary basis, for Ohio's EI Service Coordinators and EI Service Coordination Supervisors. Finally, DODD distributed a statewide provider survey and collected data on the number of therapists working in EI. The survey helped the state gain a better understanding of the makeup of the EI workforce, how local EI programs are utilizing EI providers, and potential needed professional development.

Many of Ohio's EI trainings are available in an electronic format so they can be accessed remotely and at convenient times for participants, and stakeholder input is sought throughout development of all DODD-created trainings.

Stakeholder Engagement

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Active, meaningful stakeholder involvement in all aspects of Ohio's Early Intervention program is a strong priority of the lead agency. For this reason, several years ago, Ohio formally augmented its SICC meetings with a number of additional, non-voting members. These non-voting members participate in ICC meetings, work groups, discussions, planning, and more while providing additional insight and feedback to EI staff and appointed SICC members. These additional members provided invaluable feedback over the past several years as EI staff routinely discussed SPP/APR targets and baseline and other data related to the targets, as well as the development and implementation of Ohio's SSIP. In addition to the 18 appointed SICC members, Ohio includes approximately 25 additional members. These additional members include representatives from early childhood and disability advocacy groups in the state, Ohio's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center, an organization representing the largest EI providers in the state, local EI program leadership, and the Ohio Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

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. Additionally, DODD leverages its annual family questionnaire to learn more about families' experiences in EI. In late 2022, DODD also conducted a survey of EI providers in the state to learn more about their strengths and challenges. In both surveys, DODD also asked respondents if they would be willing to participate in future solicitations for feedback about other topics.

Announcements and solicitations for feedback are distributed 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. 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 prioritizes obtaining input from and building capacity of a diverse array of families in a variety of ways. As mentioned above, feedback is sought from families via the state's annual EI Family Questionnaire. In addition to the items required to be reported in the APR, the questionnaire includes items regarding families' general experience in EI, items related to social-emotional development, and open-ended items that allow families to share more details about their experiences in EI, including what is working well, what could work better, and what has had the biggest impact on their family. The state EI team reviews comments from all open-ended items and considers family input when making program decisions. Additionally, the questionnaire includes an item that indicates the state frequently seeks input from a variety of stakeholders, including families, regarding the Ohio EI program and asks if they would be interested in being contacted to provide input.

In addition to gathering information from families via the state's annual Family Questionnaire, the state provides resources for families in order to help build their capacity on the Ohio Early Intervention website and in the program's bi-weekly EI Program Updates newsletter. The family page of the Ohio EI website includes information regarding what families can expect in EI, other families' experiences in EI, and other resources and supports for children and families. The state worked directly with parents of children who had been served in EI to make changes to the family section of the EI website in order to best meet the needs of those parents and answer the questions families are most likely to have. Additionally, the state offers trainings to the EI field that will enhance their skills in building the capacity of

families, including a Capacity-Building Practices in EI training, which focuses on the evidence-based capacity-building practices Early Intervention service coordinators use to support and strengthen families. During the next reporting year, Ohio will continue to emphasize building family capacity to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes through targeted efforts at the state's quarterly ICC meetings and the biweekly EI newsletter.

DODD again made no changes to the targets shared in the last two APRs. DODD did share with the SICC and larger stakeholder group last year that OSEP had accepted the targets that they and other Ohio Early Intervention stakeholders had set for the current APR cycle. Members continue to be grateful that their hard work had not gone unnoticed. In the lead up to the targets presented in the FY20 APR, targets for the state performance plan (SPP) were a topic of much discussion over an extended period of time with the SICC and broader EI stakeholder group in order to allow members sufficient time to review data, request additional data, and ask questions. Members discussed the targets at the March 2019, May 2019, and August 2019 SICC meetings before settling on targets. In this time period, DODD presented data, offered recommendations, sought feedback, and supported the SICC in finalizing targets. After the clarification period for the FFY18 APR and feedback from OSEP in spring 2020, DODD again discussed targets with the SICC. At its May 2020 meeting, the SICC also discussed whether it would be appropriate to update the state's baseline data for Indicators #2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 given significant program changes over the past ten years. By discussing targets over an extended period of time, DODD was able to discuss baseline and related data with stakeholders, including parents, to help build capacity to understand and situate indicators' data and the related factors that may impact a particular indicator. Over time, stakeholders became comfortable in asking to see other data, and DODD ensured that these data were presented in easy-to-understand formats and made time to discuss the data and answer questions. Finally, as part of its target-setting activities, DODD created a document for public posting that explained each indicator, provided baseline data, and a proposed a target. DODD put this document on the EI website and solicited feedback via its biweekly communication to EI stakeholders that includes parents, providers, and other stakeholders.

EI program leadership meets 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; Ohio's Infant Mortality Commission; the Ohio Home Visiting Consortium; and Family and Children First Council, which is responsible for overseeing the work of EI 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.

Number of Parent Members

4

Parent Members Engagement

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The four parent members of the SICC were actively involved over an extended period of time in analyzing data, considering improvement strategies and evaluating progress, and ultimately finalizing targets in the SPP/APR. In addition to these four appointed members of the SICC, DODD actively involved other parents of children with disabilities and representatives from organizations advocating for and representing parents of children with disabilities. In 2023, DODD also added a fifth appointed parent member to its SICC. As stated above in the "Broad Stakeholder Input" section, Ohio has formally augmented its SICC with approximately 25 additional members. These members include parents of children with disabilities, a representative from the state's Parent Training and Information Center (who also acts as multicultural

information specialist), and other advocacy groups for early childhood and disability initiatives. The stakeholder group also includes representation from an Ohio initiative dedicated to engaging, empowering, and supporting families and leadership. As described above, DODD engaged in a lengthy target-setting process over the course of many months. By discussing targets over an extended period of time, DODD was able to discuss baseline and related data with stakeholders, including parents, to help build capacity to understand and situate indicators' data and the related factors that may impact a particular indicator. Over time, stakeholders became comfortable in asking to see other data, and DODD ensured that these data were presented in easy-to-understand formats and made time to discuss the data and answer questions.

After working with this diverse group of stakeholders to create a draft proposal of targets, DODD sought broader feedback. DODD created a document for public posting that explained each indicator, provided baseline data, and a proposed target. DODD put this document on the EI website and solicited feedback via its biweekly communication to EI stakeholders that includes parents, providers, and other stakeholders. As previously mentioned, approximately 7200 people are subscribed to this EI newsletter and recipients include families of children with disabilities, advocates, and local EI partners. Feedback was shared with the broad stakeholder group, additional data were discussed, and targets were finalized at the November 2021 meeting.

How best to evaluate progress has been discussed extensively at these broad stakeholder meetings especially in the context of improving data quality related to child outcomes and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on child counts. In addition, the group is actively involved in considering improvement strategies for the EI program. Child find and public awareness for EI are discussed regularly. These stakeholders are actively involved in identifying improvement strategies as part of Ohio's SSIP and data to inform future discussions. Finally, Ohio has prioritized hearing directly from families as part of the annual family questionnaire. Comments and data from the questionnaire are used to inform improvement strategies and to evaluate progress on existing initiatives. DODD, in collaboration with stakeholders, did not make any changes to targets for FY22.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

DODD values the feedback from families when implementing activities to improve outcomes for children with disabilities and their families. Several years ago, DODD added questions to its annual family questionnaire to capture data that can inform statewide activities to improve outcomes. For the current and previous reporting periods, DODD included questions related to Ohio's new social-emotional-focused SiMR in its annual family questionnaire to gain insights directly from families. DODD has also taken steps in recent years to increase both the overall response rate and the representativeness of the respondents of the family questionnaire. Starting in FFY20, the representativeness of Black and African American respondents increased and has continued to increase through this reporting year. Finally, DODD uses its SICC and stakeholder group to ensure that the diverse feedback is shared with the department. This group has been instrumental in evaluating the state's Early Intervention infrastructure and identifying activities to improve child outcomes.

Soliciting Public Input

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As lead agency, DODD actively seeks stakeholder input. DODD uses three primary mechanisms for communicating with the public: the standalone Early Intervention website, a biweekly newsletter about Early Intervention, and the

augmented EI SICC and stakeholder group. As stated earlier in this introduction, DODD used an extended period of time with a robust group of stakeholders to analyze data and create a set of proposed targets. By spreading this process out over a two-year period, there were multiple occasions for stakeholders to review data, ask questions, and inform the process of target setting. The draft proposal agreed upon by Ohio's SICC and stakeholder group was then posted for the general public on the EI website for 30 days. Feedback was shared with SICC and stakeholder group at their November 2021 meeting. DODD used its biweekly newsletter to publicize the draft proposal and seek feedback.

Stakeholders are also very involved in developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress. DODD uses its website to provide a robust, well-organized archive of data submitted to OSEP, including APRs and SSIPs dating to FFY13. In addition to this, DODD also uses the website to post other data that is not required to be federally posted (e.g., monthly referral and child counts broken out by local EI program).

Parent engagement in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress is described in detail in the Parent Members Engagement section of this Introduction. In addition to this involvement, DODD seeks extensive family input via its annual EI Family Questionnaire. Over the past several years, DODD has placed a strong emphasis on increasing the response rate to the survey and the representativeness of its respondents. This questionnaire includes several quantitative items regarding families' general experiences in EI and items related to social-emotional development, that are part of Ohio's SSIP evaluation and inform other statewide initiatives. Additionally, the questionnaire includes open-ended items where respondents can share what in EI has worked well for their family, what could work better, what part of EI had the biggest impact on their family, and any additional comments. State staff review every comment received on these open-ended items and share the comments with each local program (de-identifying any comments before sharing, when applicable). Receiving input directly from families served in EI is incredibly useful in target setting and analyzing data, and is the ultimate measure in both the implementation of improvement strategies and the evaluation of the state EI system's progress. DODD also added an item to the questionnaire in 2022 where families can indicate whether they would be interested in being contacted when DODD is seeking stakeholder input.

Finally, DODD has worked to build a culture that actively and transparently engages with the public about the EI program. The concluding line of the introduction of every biweekly EI newsletter actively encourages readers to provide any feedback they have to the Part C Coordinator and includes his contact information. Because of this, he has received feedback from local EI leaders, early childhood stakeholders, EI providers, and families. The EI newsletters are also archived on the EI website.

Making Results Available to the Public

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

DODD has used the EI website to post all federally required documents, and DODD has also maintained a historical archive of many materials. Although this is not required, DODD believes it is important to make these materials freely available to members of the public so they can be informed active partners in shaping the state's EI program. Thus, copies of the state's APR and SSIP submissions from FFY13 through the present are easily accessible on the website. Child count and settings, exiting, and dispute resolution data for the past three years are also maintained on the website. DODD has also provided a two to three page summary version of each year's SSIP submission for readers who may not wish to review the complete submission. Multiple years of data related to Indicator 4 are also posted on the EI website. When DODD shared the SICC and stakeholder group's proposal for the APR targets with the broader public in the autumn of 2021, historical data were included in addition to the proposed targets themselves. Public input was sought for 30 days. When this APR is submitted, DODD will post this APR to the EI website along with the finalized targets. DODD and SICC and stakeholder group members discussed the importance of routinely reviewing targets, data,

improvement strategies, and evaluation at the November 2021 meeting. Improving data quality related to child outcome ratings, the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, and increasing response rates for the family questionnaire were discussed as having potential effects on different APR indicators. Any relevant updates regarding target setting, data analyses, improvement strategies, and evaluation are also included in the biweekly EI newsletter, including any available resources related to any of these areas.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each EIS Program 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, 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 by posting the 88 EI program reports on the program website (<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/>) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY21 reports were sent to all local EIS programs and posted to the EI website in May 2023. The FFY22 reports were sent to local programs in December 2023 and added to the EI website in January 2024.

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.68%	99.77%	99.71%			

FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
1,725	1,730	99.71%

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 less than three months of discovery), as specified in #B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE ON STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA.

Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY22. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between July 1, 2022 and September 30, 2022 were included in Ohio’s FFY22 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. One finding was issued to one EIS program upon completion of the baseline analysis. This finding was **identified and issued in FFY22** and therefore due for correction in FFY23 and the status of correction will be reported in the FFY23 APR.

The 1,725 child records counted as being compliant include 203 that were non-timely due to documented exceptional family circumstances. These 203 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. See below for a breakdown of reasons for non-timely receipt of services:

- Exceptional family circumstances: 203
- Staff error: 5

No TRS findings were due for correction in FFY22. A total of three noncompliant records were identified across two local programs during the FFY21 baseline analysis, but DODD looked at more recent data as part of the analysis, and the local programs subsequently corrected the noncompliance and therefore were not issued a finding. 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 2021

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
Data	98.52%	98.96%	98.94%			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio utilized an extended period of time to ensure meaningful involvement of diverse Early Intervention stakeholders in the target setting process. In addition to appointed SICC members, Ohio's SICC meetings also formally include other important stakeholders from organizations representing providers (including the largest provider of EI services in Ohio), families (including the state's parent and training center), and other key stakeholders (e.g., the Ohio Family and Children First Council). At the state's March 2019 SICC and larger EI stakeholder group meeting, DODD provided an overview of the APR indicators, along with a summary of the state's targets and results for the FFY13 through FFY18 APR cycle, indicating that the group would have a discussion at the following meeting to set targets for the next APR cycle. At the May 2019 meeting, the group had an in-depth discussion about SPP/APR targets and determined the starting target for the next SPP/APR cycle for all indicators should be the FFY17 percentage (rounded down) and the state's targets should gradually increase by the end of the SPP/APR cycle. By the state's August 2019 meeting, DODD had become aware that the current SPP/APR cycle would be extended for one year, and informed the SICC and larger EI stakeholder group of this. The group reviewed the targets discussed at the previous meeting, and agreed to keep the FFY19 targets the same as what had been discussed, but adjusted targets as needed so they were greater than the baseline percentage. As Ohio received additional guidance from OSEP, the SICC and larger stakeholder group continued to discuss targets and baseline data. At the August 2020 and August 2021 meetings of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and baseline data.

At the August 2021 meeting, it was decided to share the targets proposal settled on the prior August with an even broader group of stakeholders for any input prior to finalization. DODD posted a document reflecting the August 2020 consensus approach for FFY20-25 targets on the Ohio Early Intervention website on October 7, 2021. The document explained the targets, provided proposed targets, and invited comment and input from the public that would be shared with SICC and larger stakeholder group at their November meeting. DODD also publicized the solicitation for feedback in its biweekly newsletter about EI. This communication is now sent to approximately 7200 recipients and includes providers, advocacy groups, parents, and other EI stakeholders. Three biweekly newsletters included information about seeking feedback. DODD accepted comment for 30 days and shared results with the SICC and stakeholder group at its November meeting.

The state has not adjusted targets or baseline data for any of the performance indicators since 2021. However, DODD presents the APR each year at its November SICC meeting and shares data throughout the year at every meeting. Each August, DODD shares an extensive data report with the SICC that covers aspects of the EI program from referral to exit. At the November meeting, DODD discusses the APR, the data and measurements for each indicator, and the targets. DODD reminds members that targets can be adjusted any year and seeks input on any additional data stakeholders would like to see at future meetings. The state has a culture where stakeholders are comfortable asking questions, requesting data, and making suggestions and DODD always invites feedback on any of the APR data and the targets.

FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
13,337	13,480	98.94%

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
A1 Target	52.00%	52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%
A1 Data	52.18%	54.34%	54.61%			
A2 Target	54.00%	54.00%	55.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%
A2 Data	54.75%	54.30%	51.91%			
B1 Target	59.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
B1 Data	59.21%	60.37%	60.18%			
B2 Target	45.00%	45.00%	46.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%
B2 Data	45.35%	44.67%	42.33%			
C1 Target	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
C1 Data	62.28%	61.16%	59.52%			
C2 Target	48.00%	48.00%	49.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%
C2 Data	48.51%	48.51%	47.00%			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio utilized an extended period of time to ensure meaningful involvement of diverse Early Intervention stakeholders in the target setting process. In addition to appointed SICC members, Ohio's SICC meetings also formally include other important stakeholders from organizations representing providers (including the largest provider of EI services in Ohio), families (including the state's parent and training center), and other key stakeholders (e.g., the Ohio Family and Children First Council). At the state's March 2019 SICC and larger EI stakeholder group meeting, DODD provided an overview of the APR indicators, along with a summary of the state's targets and results for the FFY13 through FFY18 APR cycle, indicating that the group would have a discussion at the following meeting to set targets for the next APR cycle. At the May 2019 meeting, the group had an in-depth discussion about SPP/APR targets and determined the starting target for the next SPP/APR cycle for all indicators should be the FFY17 percentage (rounded down) and the state's targets should gradually increase by the end of the SPP/APR cycle. By the state's August 2019 meeting, DODD had become aware that the current SPP/APR cycle would be extended for one year, and informed the SICC and larger EI stakeholder group of this. The group reviewed the targets discussed at the previous meeting, and agreed to keep the FFY19 targets the same as what had been discussed, but adjusted targets as needed so they were greater than the baseline percentage. As Ohio received additional guidance from OSEP, the SICC and larger stakeholder group continued to discuss targets and baseline data. At the August 2020 and August 2021 meetings of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and baseline data.

At the August 2021 meeting, it was decided to share the targets proposal settled on the prior August with an even broader group of stakeholders for any input prior to finalization. DODD posted a document reflecting the August 2020 consensus approach for FFY20-25 targets on the Ohio Early Intervention website on October 7, 2021. The document explained the targets, provided proposed targets, and invited comment and input from the public that would be shared with SICC and larger stakeholder group at their November meeting. DODD also publicized the solicitation for feedback

in its biweekly newsletter about EI. This communication is now sent to approximately 7200 recipients and includes providers, advocacy groups, parents, and other EI stakeholders. Three biweekly newsletters included information about seeking feedback. DODD accepted comment for 30 days and shared results with the SICC and stakeholder group at its November meeting.

After completing analyses for FFY19 and FFY20, DODD revisited targets again for the COS indicators as the state continued to see declines in these percentages due likely to increased data quality. DODD’s new proposal was to start with the FFY20 data as the initial target as opposed to FFY17 in order to ensure the targets were as meaningful as possible. At the November 2021 meeting of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and finalized the targets contained in this APR for FFY20-25.

The state has not adjusted targets or baseline data for any of the performance indicators since 2021. However, DODD presents the APR each year at its November SICC meeting and shares data throughout the year at every meeting. Each August, DODD shares an extensive data report with the SICC that covers aspects of the EI program from referral to exit. At the November meeting, DODD discusses the APR, the data and measurements for each indicator, and the targets. DODD reminds members that targets can be adjusted any year and seeks input on any additional data stakeholders would like to see at future meetings. The state has a culture where stakeholders are comfortable asking questions, requesting data, and making suggestions and DODD always invites feedback on any of the APR data and the targets.

FFY 2022 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	46	0.48%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,106	32.14%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,495	15.47%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,297	23.77%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,719	28.14%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 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	3,792	6,944	54.61%
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	5,016	9,663	51.91%

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	64	0.66%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,248	33.61%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,261	23.40%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,745	28.41%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,345	13.92%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	5,006	8,318	60.18%
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	4,090	9,663	42.33%

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	51	0.53%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,293	34.08%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,777	18.39%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,140	32.50%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,402	14.51%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,917	8,261	59.52%
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	4,542	9,663	47.00%

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

Measure	Number
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	13,823
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.	4,370
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	9,663

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Beginning in January 2015, the Child Outcomes Summary process was integrated into the child and family assessment and overall IFSP process. At that time, Ohio began to collect the following Child Outcomes Summary statements (adopted from Maryland), using its data system, for each of the three outcome areas:

- Relative to same age peers, child’s functioning might be described as like that of a much younger child. He shows early skills, but not yet immediate foundational or age expected skills in this outcome area
- Relative to same age peers, child is showing some emerging or immediate foundational skills, which will help him to work toward age appropriate skills in the area of (outcome).
- Relative to same age peers, child is not yet using skills expected of his age. He does however use many important and immediate foundational skills to build upon in the area of this outcome
- Relative to same age peers, child shows occasional use of some age expected skills, but more of his skills are not yet age expected in the area of this outcome
- Relative to same age peers, child shows many age expected skills, but continues to show some functioning that might be described like that of a slightly younger child in the area of this outcome
- Relative to same age peers, child has the skills that we would expect of his age in regard to this outcome; however, there are concerns
- Relative to same age peers, child has all of the skills that we would expect of a child his age in the area of this outcome

The COS is required as part of the initial assessment process, as well as annually, so entry COS are completed as part of the IFSP process and documented on Ohio’s IFSP form, as well as in the state data system. Local programs still use the decision tree, along with all the information discussed in the child and family assessments to help them choose which statement above best describes the child's development comparable to same-age peers. Each statement above corresponds to a score of 1 through 7, respectively.

Exit COS are also required for all children who have been served in Early Intervention in Ohio who are exiting for a reason other than being deceased or loss of contact with the family. The Exit COS is not a part of any other particular process, but, like the entry and annual COS, is completed by the IFSP team, including the family.

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
A Target	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
A Data	92.13%	92.25%	92.68%			
B Target	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
B Data	95.01%	94.96%	95.20%			
C Target	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
C Data	93.64%	93.68%	94.42%			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio utilized an extended period of time to ensure meaningful involvement of diverse Early Intervention stakeholders in the target setting process. In addition to appointed SICC members, Ohio's SICC meetings also formally include other important stakeholders from organizations representing providers (including the largest provider of EI services in Ohio), families (including the state's parent and training center), and other key stakeholders (e.g., the Ohio Family and Children First Council). At the state's March 2019 SICC and larger EI stakeholder group meeting, DODD provided an overview of the APR indicators, along with a summary of the state's targets and results for the FFY13 through FFY18 APR cycle, indicating that the group would have a discussion at the following meeting to set targets for the next APR cycle. At the May 2019 meeting, the group had an in-depth discussion about SPP/APR targets and determined the starting target for the next SPP/APR cycle for all indicators should be the FFY17 percentage (rounded down) and the state's targets should gradually increase by the end of the SPP/APR cycle. By the state's August 2019 meeting, DODD had become aware that the current SPP/APR cycle would be extended for one year, and informed the SICC and larger EI stakeholder group of this. The group reviewed the targets discussed at the previous meeting, and agreed to keep the FFY19 targets the same as what had been discussed, but adjusted targets as needed so they were greater than the baseline percentage. As Ohio received additional guidance from OSEP, the SICC and larger stakeholder group continued to discuss targets and baseline data. At the August 2020 and August 2021 meetings of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and baseline data.

At the August 2021 meeting, it was decided to share the targets proposal settled on the prior August with an even broader group of stakeholders for any input prior to finalization. DODD posted a document reflecting the August 2020 consensus approach for FFY20-25 targets on the Ohio Early Intervention website on October 7, 2021. The document explained the targets, provided proposed targets, and invited comment and input from the public that would be shared with SICC and larger stakeholder group at their November meeting. DODD also publicized the solicitation for feedback in its biweekly newsletter about EI. This communication is now sent to approximately 7200 recipients and includes providers, advocacy groups, parents, and other EI stakeholders. Three biweekly newsletters included information about

seeking feedback. DODD accepted comment for 30 days and shared results with the SICC and stakeholder group at its November meeting.

The state has not adjusted targets or baseline data for any of the performance indicators since 2021. However, DODD presents the APR each year at its November SICC meeting and shares data throughout the year at every meeting. Each August, DODD shares an extensive data report with the SICC that covers aspects of the EI program from referral to exit. At the November meeting, DODD discusses the APR, the data and measurements for each indicator, and the targets. DODD reminds members that targets can be adjusted any year and seeks input on any additional data stakeholders would like to see at future meetings. The state has a culture where stakeholders are comfortable asking questions, requesting data, and making suggestions and DODD always invites feedback on any of the APR data and the targets.

FFY 2022 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	3,304	3,565	92.68%
4B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	3,391	3,562	95.20%
4C. Help their children develop and learn	3,365	3,564	94.42%

Overview

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 distributed to families in order to gather data for this indicator:

1. Early Intervention has helped me to know my rights in the program.
2. Early Intervention has helped me to communicate my child’s needs.
3. 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 EI in the three areas of this indicator.

The following modifications to the ECO survey were made:

- Early Intervention was substituted for Part C throughout the questionnaire as that is how families “know” Part C in Ohio.
- The adapted OSEP items (Early Intervention has helped me to know my rights in the program; Early Intervention has helped me to communicate my child’s needs; and 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 to obtain additional input from families regarding their experiences in EI

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Families served in Early Intervention on June 1, 2023 were identified as potential recipients of Ohio's 2023 EI Family Questionnaire. For all primary caregivers identified as recipients who did not have an email address listed in EIDS, the questionnaire and a one page information sheet about the questionnaire were mailed to the family. This information was also sent via mail if the email address was identified as invalid by Survey Monkey or the caregiver had opted out of receiving surveys via Survey Monkey. Finally, DODD translated the questionnaire into additional languages this year (any language that was identified as the primary language for at least five caregivers on the Family Questionnaire recipient list) and questionnaires in the family's language were mailed to these families, with the option to complete the English version of the questionnaire online. All other families were emailed a Survey Monkey link to the questionnaire, with the same information that was included in the one page sheet mailed to families in the body of the email.

Questionnaires and links were distributed in mid-August and responses were accepted through late September in order to be included in analyses. In an effort to maximize the number of survey respondents, Ohio implemented the following strategies in its administration of the family questionnaire:

- Questionnaire recipients were emailed information or mailed an information sheet explaining why DODD distributes the questionnaire and how data are used, as well as questionnaire links and the child's unique identifier to be used in completing the questionnaire.
- Recipients who received the questionnaire via email were sent several reminder emails if they had not yet completed the questionnaire.
- DODD held a webinar for local EI programs to cover the questionnaire process, including suggestions for engaging families.
- DODD provided local programs a list of questionnaire recipients and the questionnaire links so they could encourage families to respond.
- DODD included all families served at a point in time close to the questionnaire distribution in the population receiving the questionnaire.
- The questionnaire was translated into Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Chinese, French, Nepali, Pashtu, Portuguese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Telugu, and Urdu and the pertinent questionnaire was distributed to families whose primary caregiver was identified as primarily speaking each language in EIDS.
- The questionnaire was highlighted in several editions of the Part C Coordinator's bi-weekly communication to Ohio's EI field.
- DODD sent local programs interim response rates during the survey collection period so programs that were lagging in responses could increase their outreach efforts to families to encourage completion of the questionnaire. Programs with particularly low interim response rates were flagged for individualized follow up from the lead agency.

Two years ago, DODD began to require collection of caregiver email addresses in EIDS and started emailing information about and links to the Family Questionnaire directly to the majority of families. In addition to the above strategies, this has proven to be effective in increasing the state's response rate to the questionnaire compared to the past several years. As such, DODD will continue to work with local programs to ensure as many caregiver email addresses as possible are collected in EIDS and will continue to email families directly regarding the questionnaire. A substantial number of invalid email addresses have been identified, so the state will also continue to work with local programs to ensure that the email addresses entered into the data system are accurate and up to date. Additionally, the state will continue to implement the strategies listed in the bullet points above and encourage local programs to discuss the Family Questionnaire with their families, including distributing information sheets and links to complete the questionnaire so families are receiving this information in multiple different ways. Finally, DODD will continue to work specifically with local programs that have a high percentage of groups who are underrepresented in questionnaire responses to increase the response rate year over year for those groups that are underrepresented. DODD will provide targeted technical assistance to these local programs ahead of the questionnaire distribution to help ensure the programs have a plan in place to increase their outreach efforts in 2024.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Among families who were identified as having children being served on June 1, 2023, a total of 13,640 received questionnaires (with duplicates removed by caregiver information so each family only received one questionnaire and removing those who had a deceased child or did not have up-to-date contact information for the family in the data system). The state regularly shared information about response rates with local programs while the survey was open and encouraged programs with lower response rates to continue reaching out to their families regarding the questionnaire. DODD received completed questionnaires from 3,572 families, which is a response rate of 26.19% (an increase from the 22.01% response rate in FFY21). All 88 of Ohio’s counties were represented in the responses to the Family Questionnaire. Table 1 outlines the methods families used to respond to the questionnaire. DODD looked at potential nonresponse bias across race and ethnicity, county classification, child age, and gender. Please note county classification is the new comparison Ohio began to utilize this year; the classifications are from the 2013 Center for Disease Control (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics NCHS) Urban-Rural Classification Scheme for Counties¹. Because this is a new comparison and the county classification data were not included with Ohio’s FFY21 APR, the 2022 questionnaire response rates for each county classification are included in Table 3A for comparison. DODD did not identify potential nonresponse bias based on child age or gender, but did identify potential nonresponse bias for most race/ethnicity categories and Large Fringe Metro counties. Further analysis is described in the sections below. The response rate to Ohio’s EI family questionnaire has continued to increase in recent years, with nearly a 20% increase this year compared to last year. DODD will continue to implement the strategies listed in the previous section and continue to work with its local EI programs, specifically those with a high percentage of groups who are underrepresented, to identify strategies to increase the response rate, reduce any identified bias, and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. As the metro-based local programs in the state disproportionately serve the groups of families most underrepresented in the family questionnaire results, the lead agency will continue to provide technical assistance to these local programs to encourage them to place particular emphasis on engaging underrepresented groups and to support finding ways to better engage these groups, all with the intention of minimizing non-response bias.

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents’ Response Type

Response Method	Number	Percent
Email	17	0.48%
Mail	153	4.28%
Online	3,402	95.24%
Total	3,572	100%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

DODD examined the response rate by race/ethnicity categories, county classification, child age ranges, and gender. Categories where the response rate deviated 3% or less from the overall response rate were considered to be representative. Those that deviated more than 3% included all race/ethnicity categories except for White respondents. It should be noted, though, that the total number of American Indian or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander families is too small to draw meaningful conclusions about the percentage of respondents. The response rate for Large Fringe Metro counties was also more than 3% lower than the total.

¹ Ingram DD, Franco SJ. 2013 NCHS urban–rural classification scheme for counties. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 2(166). 2014.

Include the State's analysis 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 following tables provide a comparison of the race/ethnicity categories, county classification, 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, 2023 whose families received the questionnaire.

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Comparison

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents #	Non-Respondents %	Respondents #	Respondents %	Total #	Total %	Response Rate
Hispanic	901	8.95%	268	7.50%	1,169	8.57%	22.93%
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	0.16%	4	0.11%	20	0.15%	20.00%
Asian	253	2.51%	67	1.88%	320	2.35%	20.94%
Black or African American	1,603	15.92%	333	9.32%	1,936	14.19%	17.20%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	15	0.15%	1	0.03%	16	0.12%	6.25%
White	6,606	65.61%	2,700	75.59%	9,306	68.23%	29.01%
Two or More Races	674	6.69%	199	5.57%	873	6.40%	22.79%
Total	10,068	100.00%	3,572	100.00%	13,640	100.00%	26.19%

Table 3: CDC County Classification Comparison

CDC County Classification	Non-Respondents #	Non-Respondents %	Respondents #	Respondents %	Total #	Total %	Response Rate
Large Central Metro	2,615	25.97%	896	25.08%	3,511	25.74%	25.52%
Large Fringe Metro	2,453	24.36%	648	18.14%	3,101	22.73%	20.90%
Medium Metro	2,748	27.29%	835	23.38%	3,583	26.27%	23.30%
Small Metro	429	4.26%	156	4.37%	585	4.29%	26.67%
Micropolitan	1,482	14.72%	773	21.64%	2,255	16.53%	34.28%
Non-core	341	3.39%	264	7.39%	605	4.44%	43.64%
Total	10,068	100.00%	3,572	100.00%	13,640	100.00%	26.19%

Table 3A: 2022 CDC County Classification Response Rates

County Classification	Responses	Total Sent	Response Rate
Large Central Metro	541	3,149	17.18%
Large Fringe Metro	570	2,868	19.87%
Medium Metro	664	3,228	20.57%
Small Metro	120	568	21.13%
Micropolitan	653	2,150	30.37%
Non-core	195	501	38.92%
Total	2,743	12,464	22.01%

Table 4: Child Age Range Comparison

Age Range	Non-Respondents #	Non-Respondents %	Respondents #	Respondents %	Total #	Total %	Response Rate
0 to1	943	9.37%	344	9.63%	1,287	9.44%	26.73%
1 to 2	2,836	28.17%	1,112	31.13%	3,948	28.94%	28.17%
2 to 3	6,289	62.47%	2,116	59.24%	8,405	61.62%	25.18%
Total	10,068	100.00%	3,572	100.00%	13,640	100.00%	26.19%

Table 5: Gender Comparison

Gender	Non-Respondents #	Non-Respondents %	Respondents #	Respondents %	Total #	Total %	Response Rate
Female	3,746	37.21%	1299	36.37%	5,045	36.99%	25.75%
Male	6,322	62.79%	2273	63.63%	8,595	63.01%	26.45%
Total	10,068	100.00%	3572	100.00%	13,640	100.00%	26.19%

Age categories and gender of children as well as the majority of county classifications among respondent families were comparable to non-respondents and all children served on June 1, 2023 whose families received questionnaires. As mentioned, all race/ethnicity categories except White were underrepresented in regard to response rate. It should be noted, however, that the response rate within each race/ethnicity category besides Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander was higher in FFY22 than FFY21 (and, as noted above, the total number of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander families is too small to draw meaningful conclusions about the percentage of respondents). Families in large Fringe Metro counties were also underrepresented, but, while it was a smaller increase than the response rate among the rest of the county classifications, the response rate among counties in this category was a little higher than last year (20.90% this year vs. 19.87% in 2022). Although Black respondents are still underrepresented, the response rate for Black respondents increased by almost 25% compared to last year, even while significantly more Black families received the questionnaire in 2023 due to increased child counts. Ohio will continue to make efforts to further increase representativeness of Black respondents with future questionnaires.

If respondents were not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

DODD convened a work group in early 2019 to discuss ways to improve the response rate for the 2019 EI family questionnaire and the representativeness of respondents. As a result of this work group, DODD prepared a visually appealing one page flyer that provided an overview and explained the purpose of the family questionnaire, including how the data would be used. DODD again distributed informational flyers to recipient families prior to collecting questionnaire responses in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 and included information and reminders about the questionnaire in several of its bi-weekly communications to the EI field and stakeholders. EI service coordinators were encouraged to use personalized text messages or e-mails to families with links to the online versions of the questionnaire. DODD monitored and provided updates to local programs regarding the response rates throughout the data collection period. EI Program consultants also had conversations with local programs regarding response rates and representativeness of respondents.

Despite these new efforts in 2019 and 2020, Ohio's response rate and representativeness remained similar to past years. After the 2020 data collection period was over, DODD also surveyed service coordinators about their involvement in the family questionnaire to understand what they view as barriers to increasing response rates and to obtain input regarding how the process could be improved. Prior to the distribution of the 2021 questionnaire, DODD worked with

software developers for the statewide EI data system and local EI program staff to improve collection of parent e-mail addresses in order to provide parents directly with links to the annual family questionnaire. The representativeness of Black and African American families did improve significantly in 2021 and 2022, although they remain underrepresented. In 2022, DODD also required all local EI programs to respond to a solicitation for information about how local programs are engaging families and encouraging them to respond to the questionnaire, which will be useful information as the state continues to make efforts to improve representativeness going forward.

This year, DODD continued to make efforts to increase local program and family involvement in the EI family questionnaire process in order to increase both the overall response rate and representativeness. Notably, the state held a webinar prior to distributing questionnaires and that included an overview of the process and tips and suggestions for improving family engagement, maximizing response rates, and increasing representativeness. DODD distributed the link to this webinar (and afterward, a link to the posting of the recorded webinar) widely via the program's bi-weekly EI Program Updates newsletter and multiple emails to EI leadership in each local program. The state also included more general information about the questionnaire process in these manners and followed up individually with local program leadership more frequently and consistently than in past years. These efforts, along with continuing to implement strategies from past years, resulted in another increase in response rate, even with a shorter response period than in past years. The response rate to this year's questionnaire was the highest it has been in several years, and nearly 20% higher than in 2022. The response rate increased even though considerably more families received the questionnaire this year due to an increased child count on June 1, 2023. As several race/ethnicity groups were still underrepresented among respondents, Ohio will place particular emphasis on engaging these groups during its 2024 questionnaire process.

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0.90%	0.90%	1.00%	1.00%	1.10%	1.10%
Data	0.82%	0.97%	1.04%			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio utilized an extended period of time to ensure meaningful involvement of diverse Early Intervention stakeholders in the target setting process. In addition to appointed SICC members, Ohio's SICC meetings also formally include other important stakeholders from organizations representing providers (including the largest provider of EI services in Ohio), families (including the state's parent and training center), and other key stakeholders (e.g., the Ohio Family and Children First Council). At the state's March 2019 SICC and larger EI stakeholder group meeting, DODD provided an overview of the APR indicators, along with a summary of the state's targets and results for the FFY13 through FFY18 APR cycle, indicating that the group would have a discussion at the following meeting to set targets for the next APR cycle. At the May 2019 meeting, the group had an in-depth discussion about SPP/APR targets and determined the starting target for the next SPP/APR cycle for all indicators should be the FFY17 percentage (rounded down) and the state's targets should gradually increase by the end of the SPP/APR cycle. By the state's August 2019 meeting, DODD had become aware that the current SPP/APR cycle would be extended for one year, and informed the SICC and larger EI stakeholder group of this. The group reviewed the targets discussed at the previous meeting, and agreed to keep the FFY19 targets the same as what had been discussed, but adjusted targets as needed so they were greater than the baseline percentage. As Ohio received additional guidance from OSEP, the SICC and larger stakeholder group continued to discuss targets and baseline data. At the August 2020 and August 2021 meetings of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and baseline data.

At the August 2021 meeting, it was decided to share the targets proposal settled on the prior August with an even broader group of stakeholders for any input prior to finalization. DODD posted a document reflecting the August 2020 consensus approach for FFY20-25 targets on the Ohio Early Intervention website on October 7, 2021. The document explained the targets, provided proposed targets, and invited comment and input from the public that would be shared with SICC and larger stakeholder group at their November meeting. DODD also publicized the solicitation for feedback in its biweekly newsletter about EI. This communication is now sent to approximately 7200 recipients and includes providers, advocacy groups, parents, and other EI stakeholders. Three biweekly newsletters included information about seeking feedback. DODD accepted comment for 30 days and shared results with the SICC and stakeholder group at its November meeting.

The state has not adjusted targets or baseline data for any of the performance indicators since 2021. However, DODD presents the APR each year at its November SICC meeting and shares data throughout the year at every meeting. Each August, DODD shares an extensive data report with the SICC that covers aspects of the EI program from referral to exit. At the November meeting, DODD discusses the APR, the data and measurements for each indicator, and the targets. DODD reminds members that targets can be adjusted any year and seeks input on any additional data stakeholders would like to see at future meetings. The state has a culture where stakeholders are comfortable asking questions, requesting data, and making suggestions and DODD always invites feedback on any of the APR data and the targets.

FFY 2022 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2022 Data
1,336	128,822	1.04%

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	2.70%	2.70%	2.80%	2.80%	2.90%	2.90%
Data	2.57%	3.00%	3.46%			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Ohio utilized an extended period of time to ensure meaningful involvement of diverse Early Intervention stakeholders in the target setting process. In addition to appointed SICC members, Ohio's SICC meetings also formally include other important stakeholders from organizations representing providers (including the largest provider of EI services in Ohio), families (including the state's parent and training center), and other key stakeholders (e.g., the Ohio Family and Children First Council). At the state's March 2019 SICC and larger EI stakeholder group meeting, DODD provided an overview of the APR indicators, along with a summary of the state's targets and results for the FFY13 through FFY18 APR cycle, indicating that the group would have a discussion at the following meeting to set targets for the next APR cycle. At the May 2019 meeting, the group had an in-depth discussion about SPP/APR targets and determined the starting target for the next SPP/APR cycle for all indicators should be the FFY17 percentage (rounded down) and the state's targets should gradually increase by the end of the SPP/APR cycle. By the state's August 2019 meeting, DODD had become aware that the current SPP/APR cycle would be extended for one year, and informed the SICC and larger EI stakeholder group of this. The group reviewed the targets discussed at the previous meeting, and agreed to keep the FFY19 targets the same as what had been discussed, but adjusted targets as needed so they were greater than the baseline percentage. As Ohio received additional guidance from OSEP, the SICC and larger stakeholder group continued to discuss targets and baseline data. At the August 2020 and August 2021 meetings of the SICC and larger stakeholder group, members discussed targets and baseline data.

At the August 2021 meeting, it was decided to share the targets proposal settled on the prior August with an even broader group of stakeholders for any input prior to finalization. DODD posted a document reflecting the August 2020 consensus approach for FFY20-25 targets on the Ohio Early Intervention website on October 7, 2021. The document explained the targets, provided proposed targets, and invited comment and input from the public that would be shared with SICC and larger stakeholder group at their November meeting. DODD also publicized the solicitation for feedback in its biweekly newsletter about EI. This communication is now sent to approximately 7200 recipients and includes providers, advocacy groups, parents, and other EI stakeholders. Three biweekly newsletters included information about seeking feedback. DODD accepted comment for 30 days and shared results with the SICC and stakeholder group at its November meeting.

The state has not adjusted targets or baseline data for any of the performance indicators since 2021. However, DODD presents the APR each year at its November SICC meeting and shares data throughout the year at every meeting. Each August, DODD shares an extensive data report with the SICC that covers aspects of the EI program from referral to exit. At the November meeting, DODD discusses the APR, the data and measurements for each indicator, and the targets. DODD reminds members that targets can be adjusted any year and seeks input on any additional data stakeholders would like to see at future meetings. The state has a culture where stakeholders are comfortable asking questions, requesting data, and making suggestions and DODD always invites feedback on any of the APR data and the targets.

FFY 2022 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2022 Data
13,480	389,771	3.46%

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.40%	98.84%	99.38%			

FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
1,439	1,448	99.38%

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 less than three months of discovery), as specified in #B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE ON STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY22. 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. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had 45-Day timelines ending between October 1, 2022 and December 31, 2022 were included in Ohio’s FFY22 45-Day analysis. Of the 1,448 child records examined, 1,439 (99.38 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 FFY22** and therefore due for correction in FFY23 and the status of correction will be reported in the FFY23 APR.

The 1,439 child records counted as being compliant include 530 that were non-timely due to documented exceptional family circumstances. These 530 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. See below for a breakdown of reasons for all missed 45-Day timelines:

- Exceptional family circumstances: 530
- Staff error/System reason: 9

Three findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY22. These findings were reported in the FFY21 APR, based on FFY21 data, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. All three findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP’s Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Three findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY22. These findings were reported in the FFY21 APR, based on FFY21 data, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. All three findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP’s Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

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:

- **Delaware:** 12 records reviewed; timelines ending in February and March 2023
- **Morgan:** 3 records verified; timelines ending February and March 2022
- **Stark:** 26 records verified; timelines ending February and March 2022

Please note: Findings were issued in late March 2022. We began extracting data for verification of correction right away, but the data are delayed by a month as we allow for 30 days for data entry (e.g., in April 2022, after findings were issued, we pulled 45-day timelines ending in February 2022). This is why we used records from both February and March of 2022 and February and March 2023 to verify correction of noncompliance.

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

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 components of the 45-Day timeline were completed for all children, 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 Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.27%	99.72%	99.69%			

8A FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
643	645	99.69%

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 less than three months of discovery), as specified in #B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE ON STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY22. 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. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had IFSPs with Transition Steps and Services due between January 1, 2023 through March 31, 2023 were included in Ohio’s FFY22 Transition Steps and Services analysis. Of the 645 child records examined, 643 (99.69 percent) were compliant. No findings were issued to EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis. A total of two noncompliant records were identified across two local programs during the FFY22 baseline analysis, but DODD looked at more recent data as part of the analysis, and the local programs subsequently corrected the noncompliance and therefore were not issued a finding. 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 643 child records counted as being compliant include 63 that were non-timely due to documented exceptional family circumstances. These 63 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. See below for a breakdown of reasons for missed Transition Steps and Services timelines:

- Exceptional family circumstances: 63
- Staff Error: 2

One Steps and Services findings was due for correction in FFY22. This finding was reported in the FFY21 APR, **based on FFY21 data**, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. This finding was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP’s Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

8A Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

One Steps and Services findings were due for correction in FFY22. This finding was reported in the FFY21 APR, **based on FFY21 data**, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. This finding was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP’s Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

The EIS program found to be noncompliant with Transition Steps and Services 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. 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, an IFSP within the required timeframe 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:

- **Morrow:** 3 records verified; timelines ending in April and May 2022

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

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 Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%	100%			

8B FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
6,514	6,514	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 does not opt out of sharing 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 less than three months of discovery), as specified in #B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE ON STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA.

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from EIS programs. Reports due February 1, 2023 were generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2023 and January 31, 2024 who were potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out of notification (913 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). The LEAs were informed in a timely manner for all 6,514 (100%) toddlers turning three in the referenced timeframe and whose families did not opt out of notification. DODD also ensured the SEA was notified of all 6,514 children for the February 1, 2023 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 FFY22 data.

There were no LEA/SEA findings due for correction in FFY22.

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 EI programs. Reports due February 1, 2023 were generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2023 and January 31, 2024 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out of notification (913 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). 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 does not opt out of sharing 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 6,514 (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 6,514 children for the February 1, 2023 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 2021

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

8C Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.65%	99.55%	100%			

8C FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
619	619	100%

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 less than three months of discovery), as specified in #B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE ON STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA#B-7 OF THE GUIDANCE IN STATE GENERAL SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PARTS B AND C OF IDEA.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY22. 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. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between January 1, 2023 and March 31, 2023 were included in Ohio's FFY22 Transition Planning Conference analysis. All 619 child records examined (100 percent) were compliant. No findings were issued to EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis.

The 619 child records counted as being compliant include 80 that were non-timely due to documented exceptional family circumstances. These 80 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. See below for a breakdown of reasons for missed TPC timelines:

- Exceptional family circumstances: 80

There were three TPC findings due for correction in FFY22. These findings were included in the FFY21 APR, **based on FFY21 data**, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. All of these findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP's Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

There were three TPC findings due for correction in FFY22. These findings were included in the FFY21 APR, **based on FFY21 data**, and **identified and issued in FFY21**. All of these findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP's Guidance on State General Supervision Responsibilities Under Parts B and C of IDEA. 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.

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 programs 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:

- **Athens:** 7 records verified; timelines ending in May and June 2022
- **Licking:** 12 records verified; timelines ending October and November 2022
- **Morrow:** 3 records verified; timelines ending in April and May 2022

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

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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2022 Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data
N/A	N/A	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)

Data and Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2022 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 2022 Data
0	0	0	N/A