



# OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016– June 30, 2017)

Submitted January 30, 2018

## Introduction

### ***Executive Summary***

The reporting year ending June 30, 2017 was also the end of the first year that the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD) served as the lead agency for Ohio's Part C Early Intervention program. This was an important and exciting year filled with much change, as well as much stability. DODD began the process of reviewing all program policies and rules with a diverse group of stakeholders. A new system of payments rule was discussed throughout the reporting period and later implemented in August 2017. The vast majority of EI providers remained the same throughout this transition year, providing important stability to both families and the provider field. In the area of general supervision, DODD launched a statewide training around data and monitoring standards during this reporting period. This training, focused on a local leadership audience, provided local programs with useful tools to ensure compliance with federal regulations. Also during this rating period, DODD began a multi-year process focused on the ten mandated responsibilities of service coordinators. This comprehensive process has involved examination of child records, local policies, interviews with local staff and more. Finally, DODD has welcomed and encouraged active stakeholder involvement. DODD relies heavily on the input of other state agencies, EI providers, and families to craft policies, trainings, and guidance that is clear and effective.

### ***General Supervision System***

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

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

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

### ***Technical Assistance System:***

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

Six EI program consultants work at DODD and provide timely, high quality technical assistance to all 88 Ohio county EI programs. The program consultants work closely with the data and monitoring team to ensure that technical assistance is targeted to local program needs. Program consultants make site visits, engage in conference calls, complete record reviews, and other activities to support local programs' implementation of state and federal Part C regulations and best EI practices.

During the most recent reporting period, DODD continued to put particular focus on Child Outcome Summary statements, the evaluation/assessment process, and foundational principles of Early Intervention. DODD began a new process in this reporting period focused on the ten mandated responsibilities of the service coordinator (34 CFR 303.34(b)). EI program consultants and members of the data and monitoring team started with a comprehensive assessment of local programs' implementation of four of the ten responsibilities. These four responsibilities included those specified at 34 CFR 303.34(b)(1), (2), (3), (8). Each local program's technical assistance plan will be updated based on the assessment of the local program's strengths and challenges in implementing the four responsibilities evaluated this period. During the next two years, DODD will complete assessments of local programs' implementation of the remaining six responsibilities

DODD continues to communicate via a formal update memo on a bi-weekly basis with the EI field to provide important updates and explanations about program requirements, due dates, and training opportunities. The memo is geared to local EI program leadership, but any interested person can sign up to receive the communication. As of November 2017, the communication has approximately 1000 recipients. The communications are also archived on the EI program's website.

### ***Professional Development System:***

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

Ohio continued in this reporting period to make significant strides forward in the area of professional development. Not only did Ohio create and contract for a number of new trainings, but it continued to ensure that trainings were available in multiple formats. The new trainings run the gamut of in-person trainings, instructor-led webinars, and user-directed webinars. After state staff perform in-person versions of each training, a decision is made about the best format for the training. Since in-person trainings present fiscal and geographic barriers for both attendees and instructors, the state focuses on using technology to meet training needs through more accessible means.

Ohio contracted with several outside trainers to provide statewide trainings on different topics. These topics included family-centered practices, childhood trauma, difficult conversations, and functional assessment. The functional assessment training was a 30 hour course taught by Dr. Lee Ann Jung. DODD data and monitoring staff delivered several regional trainings throughout the state about EI monitoring standards, the EI data system, and how to use EI data to improve program outcomes. DODD staff also designed and delivered a statewide training about the new system of payments rule. Desk aids resulting from these trainings were created and put on the EI website for staff throughout the state to use.

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

### ***Stakeholder Involvement:***

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

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

The lead agency invites public comment on the APR, annual application for Part C IDEA funds, and any rule or form changes. The public is invited to provide comment for a minimum of thirty calendar days for any document submitted

to the USDOE/OSEP. All documents are posted on the program website (<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/>) for a minimum of sixty calendar days.

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

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

At the November 14, 2017 meeting, this APR was discussed with both the SICC and EI stakeholder group. There were no changes made to the targets in the SPP.

### ***Reporting to the Public:***

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

DODD provides the public with a report on each EIS program's performance on the APR indicators, as well as each program's determination category and a description of the method used to make determinations by posting the 88 EI program reports on the program website (<https://ohioearlyintervention.org/>) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY15 reports were added and an electronic copy of the reports was sent to all local EIS programs in late February 2017. The FFY16 reports will be added to the website by June 2018.

## Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2016 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner or had an acceptable NCR	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2016 Data
1,174	1,184	99.16%

#### 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).

Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2016. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between January 1, 2017 and March 31, 2017 were included in Ohio's FFY16 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 its percent compliance for this indicator. The 1,174 child records counted as being compliant include 107 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 107 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. A total of four findings were issued to four EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis. These findings were identified and issued in FFY17, so they will be due for correction in FFY18 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

There were nine TRS findings due for correction in FFY16, five of which were reported in Ohio's FFY14 APR and four of which were reported in Ohio's FFY15 APR, and all of which were identified and issued in FFY15. All nine findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

## Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

### *Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015*

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

### *FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*

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

Nine findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY16, all nine of which were corrected in a timely manner. All were verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

All EIS programs found to be noncompliant with TRS 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. These memos were issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified.

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.

Using the above approach, the state verified a randomly selected, representative sample of child records from each local program to ensure that for each child, all new services began within thirty days of the signed IFSP or that any delays in this timeline were due to family reasons. If applicable, the state continued to examine data and request records to verify until all TRS 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 programs as follows:

- **Columbiana:** 3 records verified; TRS due dates in January and February 2016
- **Jackson:** 5 records verified; TRS due dates in October and November 2016
- **Meigs:** 2 records verified; TRS due dates in October and December 2015 (there were no applicable records in November 2015 for this county)
- **Muskingum:** 15 records verified; TRS due dates in June and July 2016
- **Union:** 4 records verified; TRS due dates in May and June 2016
- **Greene:** 27 records verified; TRS due dates November and December 2016
- **Jefferson:** 8 records verified; TRS due dates in May and June 2016
- **Noble:** 5 records verified; TRS due dates in March and April 2016
- **Wayne:** 14 records verified; TRS due dates in March and April 2016

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

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

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	100%	100%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

### FFY 2016 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs on 12-1-16 who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs on 12-1-16	FFY 2016 Data
10,030	10,220	98.14%

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target A2	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Target B1	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target B2	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target C1	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target C2	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

**FFY 2016 Data**

<b>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed</b>	6,626
---	-------

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

	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	77	1.16%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,502	22.67%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	550	8.30%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,323	19.97%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,174	47.90%

	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2016 Data</b>
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	1,873	3,452	54.26%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,497	6,626	67.87%

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

	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	85	1.28%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,576	23.79%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	812	12.25%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,907	28.78%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,246	33.90%

	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2016 Data</b>
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	2,719	4,380	62.08%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,153	6,626	62.68%

***Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs***

	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	76	1.15%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,653	24.95%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	911	13.75%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,282	34.44%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,704	25.72%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 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	3,193	4,922	64.87%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,986	6,626	60.16%

**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-aged peers. Each statement above corresponds to a score of 1 to 7, respectively.

Exit COS are also required for all children who have been served in Early Intervention in Ohio, and 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.

**Comments**

Ohio changed its manner for collecting Child Outcomes data January 15, 2015. Prior to that date, the Child Outcomes Summary Form was used to collect child outcomes data. Beginning in January 2015, the Child Outcomes Summary process was integrated into the child and family assessment process. At that time, Ohio’s data system was updated, as

well, to collect only Child Outcomes Summary statements (adopted from Maryland) for each of the three outcome areas.

Because the new method for collecting child outcomes data was implemented in January 2015, all children with the needed COS data who exited in FFY16 but were served prior to January 15, 2015 had their entry ratings completed using the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Around 12% of all entry scores for children included in Ohio’s FFY16 Child Outcomes data were completed using the COSF (718 of 6,602) and the majority using the new COS statements (5,884).

For all summary statements, the subset of children who had both their entry and exit ratings completed using the COS summary statements produced higher percentages. Because the majority of children for this reporting year had both their entry and their exit COS data collected using the new method, any biases in percentages based on different methods of collecting entry COS data are assumed to be very minimal. The new method for collecting child outcomes data is also expected to ultimately produce more accurate ratings. See tables below for a breakdown of results by entry rating method.

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

Summary Statement	COSF	COS	Total
SS1	50.00%	54.97%	54.26%
SS2	57.38%	69.14%	67.87%

Category	COSF		COS		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	67	1.13%	10	1.39%	77	1.16%
b	1,264	21.39%	238	33.15%	1,502	22.67%
c	492	8.33%	58	8.08%	550	8.30%
d	1,133	19.18%	190	26.46%	1,323	19.97%
e	2,952	49.97%	222	30.92%	3,174	47.90%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,908</b>		<b>718</b>		<b>6,626</b>	

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

Summary Statement	COSF	COS	Total
SS1	54.61%	63.21%	62.08%
SS2	49.03%	64.34%	62.68%

Category	COSF		COS		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	71	1.20%	14	1.95%	85	1.28%
b	1,329	22.49%	247	34.40%	1,576	23.79%
c	707	11.97%	105	14.62%	812	12.25%
d	1,698	28.74%	209	29.11%	1,907	28.78%
e	2,103	35.60%	143	19.92%	2,246	33.90%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,908</b>		<b>718</b>		<b>6,626</b>	

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Summary Statement	COSF	COS	Total
SS1	56.49%	66.07%	64.87%
SS2	43.73%	62.15%	60.16%

Category	COSF		COS		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	64	1.08%	12	1.67%	76	1.15%
b	1,397	23.65%	256	35.65%	1,653	24.95%
c	775	13.12%	136	18.94%	911	13.75%
d	2,070	35.04%	212	29.53%	2,282	34.44%
e	1,602	27.12%	102	14.21%	1,704	25.72%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,908</b>		<b>718</b>		<b>6,626</b>	

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	98.00%	99.00%	100%
Target B ≥	99.00%	100%	100%
Target C ≥	98.00%	99.00%	100%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

## FFY 2016 Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	# of Positive Responses	Total Respondents	Percent
4A. Know their rights	1,612	1,700	94.82%
4B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	1,626	1,704	95.42%
4C. Help their children develop and learn	1,614	1,708	94.50%

### Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

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

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

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

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

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

The following modifications were made:

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

#### Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on July 1, 2017 were identified as potential recipients. DODD mailed the surveys to families mid-August 2017 and surveys were due back by October 27th, 2017. In an effort to maximize the number of survey respondents, Ohio implemented the following strategies in its administration of the family questionnaire:

- DODD notified county agencies of survey recipients so they could encourage families to respond.
- As was done in previous years, the sample of families surveyed was increased by utilizing a sampling date close to the survey distribution, as well as by including families who had exited the program in the population of potential survey recipients.
- The survey was translated into Spanish and distributed to families whose primary caregiver was identified as primarily Spanish-speaking in Ohio's Part C program's data system (Early Track).
- Families were provided the option to respond to the questionnaire via mailing back to DODD or by completing online in either English or Spanish.
- Families were given an extended period of time to respond to the survey (approximately 10 weeks).

### Questionnaire Response

Of 10,252 families who were identified as having children being served on July 1, 2017, a total of 9,957 received questionnaires (with those not receiving questionnaires being due to a deceased child or not having up-to-date address information for the family in the data system). DODD received 1,755 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 17.63%. Eighty-five of Ohio's eighty-eight counties were represented in the responses to the Family Questionnaire. The following table outlines the methods families used to respond to the questionnaire:

**Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents' Response Type**

Response Method	Number	Percent
Mail	1,600	91.17%
Web	155	8.83%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,755</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Respondent Representativeness

The following tables provide a comparison of the race/ethnicity and age categories between the respondents and non-respondents of the questionnaire, as well as the totals for all children served in EI in Ohio on July 1, 2017.

**Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Comparison**

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	27	0.33%	1	0.06%	28	0.28%
Asian	222	2.71%	33	1.88%	255	2.56%
Black	1,206	14.70%	111	6.32%	1,317	13.23%
Hispanic	396	4.83%	66	3.76%	462	4.64%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	14	0.17%	2	0.11%	16	0.16%
Two or More Races	450	5.49%	79	4.50%	529	5.31%
White	5,887	71.78%	1,463	83.36%	7,350	73.82%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,202</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,755</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9,957</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 3: Child Age Category**

Age Category	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 to 1	1,029	12.55%	243	13.85%	1,272	12.77%
1 to 2	2,521	30.74%	534	30.43%	3,055	30.68%
2 to 3	4,652	56.72%	978	55.73%	5,630	56.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,202</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,755</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9,957</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age categories of respondents were comparable to those of all children served on July 1, 2016. In regard to age and race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, with White families somewhat overrepresented and Black respondents somewhat underrepresented. Ohio employed a general approach to attempt to increase representativeness this reporting year by increasing the response time for the surveys as well as asking local programs to encourage their families to participate in the survey. Ohio will consider several, more targeted options to ensure better representativeness among respondents going forward, potentially including performing extra outreach to underrepresented groups, re-sending surveys, and offering different response options.

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Target		1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%	1.60%	1.20%	1.20%	1.30%
Data	1.38%	1.43%	1.66%	1.8%	1.75%	1.86%	1.76%	1.19%	1.03%	1.01%	0.97%

#### FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	1.30%	1.40%	1.40%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

#### FFY 2016 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs on 12-1-16	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2016 Data
1,329	137,896	0.96%

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	2.80%	2.90%	2.90%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

#### FFY 2016 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2016 Data
10,220	417,656	2.45%

## Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2016 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 or had an acceptable NCR	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2016 Data
913	939	97.23%

#### 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).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2016. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had 45-Day timelines ending between July 1, 2016 and September 30, 2016 were included in Ohio's FFY16 45-Day analysis. Of the 939 child records examined, 913 (97.23 percent) were compliant. A total of six findings were issued to six EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis. These findings were identified and issued

in FFY16 and therefore they are due for correction in FFY17 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

The 913 child records counted as being compliant include 230 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 230 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were no 45 Day findings due for correction in FFY16. There were 7 findings reported in Ohio’s FFY15 APR, but the findings weren’t identified and issued until FFY16 and therefore are due to be corrected in FFY17. Note: There was an additional finding inadvertently left out of the FFY15 APR, so 8 findings, in total, were issued in FFY15. The status of correction of these findings will be reported in Ohio’s FFY17 APR.

## Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

### *Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015*

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	0	0

## Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

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

### 8A Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

### 8A FFY 2016 Data

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services or had an acceptable NCR	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2016 Data
414	418	99.04%

**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).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2016. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children in the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between October 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016 were included in Ohio's FFY16 Transition Steps analysis. Of the 418 child records examined, 414 (99.04 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were identified and issued in FFY17 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

The 414 child records counted as being compliant include 11 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 11 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

One Steps finding was due for correction in FFY16. This finding was included in the FFY14 APR as it was based on FFY14 data, but not identified and issued until FFY15. The finding was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that the EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. There were also two findings reported in Ohio's FFY15 APR, but they were issued in FFY16 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

## 8A Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

### *Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015*

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
1	1	0	0

### *FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*

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

One finding for this indicator was due for correction in FFY16, which was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

The EIS program found to be noncompliant with 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 memo was issued as soon as possible after noncompliance was identified.

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

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

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

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

**Belmont:** 3 records verified; TPCs due in June and July 2015

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

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

## 8B Historical Data and Targets

### *Historical Data*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	97.48%	90.22%	86.92%	97.40%	93.10%	97.82%	100%	99.92%	0%	100%

### *FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets*

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

## 8B FFY 2016 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	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2016 Data

<b>toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services</b>		
5,098	5,118	99.61%

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Ohio EIS programs are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA by February 1st; May 1st; August 1st; and November 1st each year, that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. Although the report due dates do not correspond to a state or federal fiscal year, because each report includes all children who will be turning three within a year of the report due date, the state ensures that, over the course of the four report submissions, LEAs are notified 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.

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from EIS programs. Reports due February 1, 2017 were generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2017 and January 31, 2018 who were potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (513 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). Of 5,118 toddlers turning three in the referenced time frame and whose families did not opt out of notification, the LEAs were informed in a timely manner for 5,098 (99.61%). Ohio ensured the SEA was notified of all 5,118 children for the February 1, 2017 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.

One finding was issued to one EIS program based on FFY16 data. This finding was identified and issued in FFY16, and will be due for correction in FFY17 and the status of the finding will be reported in Ohio’s FFY17 APR. There were no LEA/SEA findings due for correction in FFY16.

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

**State monitoring**

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from local Help Me Grow EI programs. Reports due February 1, 2017 were generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2017 and January 31, 2018 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (513 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). Currently, counties are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA (due February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st each year) that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. Counties are then required to submit proof of doing so to DODD for the February 1 report, which is used for the APR compliance analysis. Of 5,118 toddlers turning three in the referenced time frame and whose families did not opt out of notification, the LEAs were informed in a timely manner for all 5,098 (99.61%). DODD notified the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the state’s SEA, about all of these children in a timely manner. 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 2015

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 Historical Data and Targets

### Historical Data

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

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

## 8C FFY 2016 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, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B or had an acceptable NCR	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2016 Data
410	418	98.09

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).

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2016. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between October 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016 were included in Ohio's

FFY16 Transition Planning Conference analysis. Of the 418 child records examined, 410 (98.09 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were identified and issued in FFY17 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY18 APR.

The 418 child records counted as being compliant include 43 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 43 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There was one TPC finding due for correction in FFY16. This finding was included in the FFY14 APR as it was based on FFY14 data, but not identified and issued until FFY15. The finding was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that the EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. There were also two findings reported in Ohio’s FFY15 APR, but they were issued in FFY16 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

## 8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

### *Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015*

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
1	1	0	0

### *FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*

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

One for this indicator was due for correction in FFY16, which was corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. DODD ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

The EIS program found to be noncompliant with 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.

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

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

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

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

- **Belmont:** 3 records verified; TPCs due in June and July 2015

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

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

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A
-----

### FFY 2016 Data

#### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	N/A

## Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

### Historical Data and Targets

#### Historical Data

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

#### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A
-----

### FFY 2016 Data

#### FFY 2016 SPP/APR 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 2016 Data
0	0	0	N/A