



OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015– June 30, 2016)

Originally submitted January 30, 2017
Submitted with clarifications May 1, 2017

Introduction

Executive Summary

The most recent reporting period saw both enormous changes in Ohio's Part C Early Intervention program and stability. Throughout this APR's reporting period, Ohio worked to change lead agencies from the Ohio Department of Health (ODH) to the Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD). This change became effective July 1, 2016. Notwithstanding this significant change, much remained the same in Ohio's EI program, both before and after the lead agency change. ODH EI staff co-located with DODD EI staff beginning in February of 2016. Throughout the transition, general supervision, technical assistance, and professional development went on as planned. If anything, the co-location of staff from both state agencies led to greater clarity and efficiencies in these three areas.

Throughout this reporting period, and especially because of the change in lead agency, both ODH and DODD were in frequent contact with stakeholders to update them on the transition and to seek their feedback on how to ease the transition. The two state agencies' primary focus was ensuring that families and EI service providers experienced no disruption or confusion due to the change in lead agency. Based on the positive stakeholder feedback, DODD/ODH believes that it has been successful.

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 during this reporting period, ODH, requires local EI programs to practice and the sanctions ODH will take if noncompliance is identified.

In addition to these rules, Ohio also utilizes its website, memos, conference calls, and newsletters to provide technical assistance around the requirements of IDEA Part C. Technical assistance (TA) 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%.

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.

Both ODH and DODD provided technical assistance in FFY15. EI program consultants sat at both state agencies and provided timely, high quality technical assistance to all 88 Ohio county-based EI programs. Throughout the majority of FFY15, ODH and DODD divided the technical assistance work by topic. Each local EI program had one ODH and one DODD TA consultant. Consultants from both agencies worked in tandem to deliver one message to the field. Both

agencies participated in training development and delivery, support of requests from EI programs in the way of on-site program visits, and monitoring and verification of data.

ODH provided grant money to the local service coordination agencies and provided technical assistance around the grant's allowable expenditures, program and expenditure reports, and program integrity and adherence to the program rule (OAC 3701-8). DODD program consultants provided technical assistance that focused on evaluation and assessment, IFSP outcome development, and service provision. During the most recent reporting period, DODD and ODH consultants put particular focus on Child Outcome Summary statements, the evaluation/assessment process, and foundational principles of Early Intervention. To that end, DODD created and revised a number of new trainings about the IFSP process and evaluation/assessment. In addition, DODD contracted with the Family, Infant, and Preschool Program (FIPP) to develop several self-paced learning modules that explain topics such as principles of Early Intervention, family-centered practices, coaching, and the primary service provider approach to EI service delivery.

ODH continued to communicate on a bi-weekly basis with the EI field to provide important updates and explanations about program requirements, due dates, and training opportunities. ODH sent an electronic communication every other Friday to all EI service coordination contract managers. DODD partners sent the communication to their network of county boards of developmental disabilities at the same time.

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.

During the most recent reporting period, Ohio continued to make significant strides forward in the area of professional development. Not only did Ohio create or 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 performed in-person versions of each training, a decision was made about the best format for the training. Since in-person trainings present fiscal and geographic barriers for both attendees and instructors, the state focused on using technology to meet training needs through more accessible means.

Ohio contracted with FIPP to create trainings related to natural environments, coaching, and the primary service provider approach to EI service delivery. These are self-paced, web-based modules. During the reporting period, data and monitoring staff began developing a training about EI monitoring standards, the EI data system, and how to use EI data to improve program outcomes. This training was delivered in the FFY16.

Finally, these trainings were not created in a vacuum, as stakeholder input was sought throughout development. This involvement was not limited to discussions with our State Inter-Agency Coordinating Council (SICC), as our training protocol is to pilot trainings with local stakeholders prior to broader release to the field. Any feedback from trainees' was 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 for a minimum of sixty calendar days.

EI program leadership from both ODH and DODD 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 infant hearing program, and Family and Children First Council which is responsible for overseeing the work of service coordination at the local level in Ohio. 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 our bi-weekly communication to the field, web page, and social media accounts to EI providers, parents, stakeholders, grantees, service providers, county boards of developmental disabilities, and Regional Infant Hearing Program providers. In addition to these electronic communication strategies, ODH and partners at DODD engaged 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, advisement, or assistance. The state has also had ad hoc calls with this group as needed.

During the most recent reporting period, as Ohio worked to make a change in lead agency from ODH to DODD, stakeholders were engaged all along the way. ODH and DODD made a strong effort to ensure that information was communicated quickly and accurately to stakeholders. Many stakeholders commented favorably on the smoothness of the transition.

At the November 9, 2016 meeting, this APR was discussed with both the SICC and EI stakeholder group. There was a robust discussion and many questions were answered. 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.

The public is provided 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 (www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY14 reports were added and an electronic copy of the reports was sent to all local EIS programs in late February 2016. The FFY15 reports will be added to the website by June 2017.

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

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target	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%

FFY 2015- FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2015 Data
1,252	1,264	99.05%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	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 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 2015. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between October 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY15 TRS analysis. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. The 1,252 child records counted as being compliant include 100 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 100 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 issued in FFY15, so they will be due for correction in FFY16 and the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY16 APR.

There were nine TRS findings due for correction in FFY15, which were reported in Ohio’s FFY13 APR but not issued until FFY14. (Note: In Ohio’s FFY13 and FFY14 APR reports, eight TRS findings due for correction in FFY15 were referenced, but the correct number was nine findings). Eight of the nine findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The additional finding has since been corrected. ODH ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

There were an additional five findings reported in the FFY14 APR. However, these findings were identified and issued in FFY15 and therefore due for correction in FFY16, so the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY16 APR.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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	8	1	0

FFY 2014 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 FFY15, eight of which were corrected in a timely manner and the last of which has since been corrected. All were verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. ODH 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, once findings of noncompliance are issued, the state extracts data from the State data system and monitors local program progress on the indicator on a monthly basis. Prior to January 2015, the specific conditions around when records were requested for verification varied slightly based on the local program's baseline compliance percentage, as follows:

- If a local program was between 90% and 99% compliant for the baseline analysis, when one month of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested
- If a local program was between 80% and 89% compliant for the baseline analysis, when two consecutive months of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested
- If a local program was below 80% compliant for the baseline analysis, they were required to submit a Corrective Action Plan; additionally, when two consecutive months of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested

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:

- **Ashland:** 5 records verified, TRS due dates in September and October 2015
- **Coshocton:** 6 records verified; TRS due dates in August and September 2014
- **Erie:** 10 records verified; TRS due dates in June 2014
- **Lake:** 22 records verified; TRS due dates in June and July 2014
- **Mahoning:** 11 records verified; TRS due dates in June 2014
- **Marion:** 11 records verified; TRS due dates in July and August 2014
- **Richland:** 10 records verified; TRS due dates in October and November 2014
- **Summit:** 41 records verified; TRS due dates January through March 2014
- **Wood:** 20 records verified; TRS due dates in June 2014

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 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

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

FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	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 2015 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 2015 Data
9,625	10,195	94.41%

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
A1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.10%	58.00%	60.00%
	Data	63.02%	60.44%	59.07%	55.33%	57.60%	58.06%	63.22%
A2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.70%	63.40%	66.00%	67.00%
	Data	63.34%	62.10%	66.81%	66.65%	65.76%	62.57%	65.65%
B1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	58.00%	60.00%
	Data	62.85%	62.41%	59.27%	56.81%	58.33%	59.58%	62.16%
B2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	60.00%	61.00%
	Data	62.93%	62.10%	66.89%	61.20%	60.43%	57.60%	59.96%
C1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.30%	62.60%	64.00%	65.00%
	Data	62.50%	60.98%	59.21%	62.58%	63.50%	63.48%	65.31%
C2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	62.00%	63.60%	64.00%	65.00%
	Data	63.49%	61.85%	67.57%	64.88%	64.28%	60.95%	63.71%

FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target A2 ≥	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Target B1 ≥	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target B2 ≥	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target C1 ≥	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target C2 ≥	66.00%	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 2015 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	5,571
---	-------

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	130	2.33%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,242	22.29%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	457	8.20%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,435	25.76%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,307	41.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 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	1,892	3,264	57.97%
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	3,742	5,571	67.17%

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	138	2.48%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,269	22.78%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	641	11.51%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,723	30.93%

e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,800	32.31%	
	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 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	2,364	3,771	62.69%
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	3,523	5,571	63.24%

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	145	2.60%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,388	24.91%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	683	12.26%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,903	34.16%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,452	26.06%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 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	2,586	4,119	62.78%
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	3,355	5,571	60.22%

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

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.

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

The following question was inadvertently excluded from the COS ratings in the data system with the change in data collection method in January 2015, but was added February 17, 2016 for each of the outcomes areas: "Has the child shown any NEW SKILLS or BEHAVIORS related to [outcome area] since the last Child Outcomes Summary rating?" In an effort to obtain as much data for these questions as possible for the FFY15 analysis, Ohio sent out lists in April 2016 of children who had been exited from EI between July 1, 2015 and February 16, 2016 and asked that each local program go back into the child records and enter the answers for these questions. After extracting the data for the FFY15 analysis in October 2016, Ohio again sent out a list of children to any county who had children for whom the answer to the above question affected the 'a' through 'e' category used in the summary statement calculations. Responses were received via Excel spreadsheet and were manually updated in the dataset. Counties were also asked to go in and update the child record in the data system where possible. Any child for whom this additional information was not received was excluded from the analysis.

Because the new method for collecting child outcomes data was implemented in January 2015, all children with the needed COS data who exited in FFY15 but were served prior to January 15, 2015 had their entry ratings completed using the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). In total, just over half of all entry scores for children included in Ohio's FFY15 Child Outcomes data were completed using the COSF (2,821 of 5,571) and just under half using the new COS statements (2,750). See tables below for a breakdown of results by entry rating method.

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

Summary Statement	Old (COSF)	New (COS Statements)	Total
SS1	56.47%	59.93%	57.97%
SS2	63.38%	71.05%	67.17%

Category	Old (COSF)		New (COS Statements)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	82	2.91%	48	1.75%	130	2.33%
b	725	25.70%	517	18.80%	1,242	22.29%
c	226	8.01%	231	8.40%	457	8.20%
d	821	29.10%	614	22.33%	1,435	25.76%
e	967	34.28%	1,340	48.73%	2,307	41.41%
Total	2,821	100.00%	2,750	100.00%	5,571	100.00%

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

Summary Statement	Old (COSF)	New (COS Statements)	Total
SS1	61.58%	64.11%	62.69%
SS2	58.60%	68.00%	63.24%

Category	Old (COSF)		New (COS Statements)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	84	2.98%	54	1.96%	138	2.48%
b	729	25.84%	540	19.64%	1,269	22.78%
c	355	12.58%	286	10.40%	641	11.51%
d	948	33.61%	775	28.18%	1,723	30.93%
e	705	24.99%	1,095	39.82%	1,800	32.31%
Total	2,821	100.00%	2,750	100.00%	5,571	100.00%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Summary Statement	Old (COSF)	New (COS Statements)	Total
SS1	58.06%	68.11%	62.78%
SS2	55.41%	65.16%	60.22%

Category	Old (COSF)		New (COS Statements)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
a	102	3.62%	43	1.56%	145	2.60%
b	814	28.86%	574	20.87%	1,388	24.91%
c	342	12.12%	341	12.40%	683	12.26%
d	926	32.83%	977	35.53%	1,903	34.16%
e	637	22.58%	815	29.64%	1,452	26.06%
Total	2,821	100.00%	2,750	100.00%	5,571	100.00%

For all summary statements, the subset of children who had both their entry and exit scores completed using the COS summary statements produced higher percentages. For all outcomes, a higher percentage of children were ranked a '7' and a lower percentage a '3' or a '4' at entry. (Note: As described above, with the new method, since scores are not actually chosen, each COS statement corresponds to a score of 1 through 7).

Though the new method for collecting child outcomes data is expected to ultimately produce more accurate ratings, the comparison of scores among those who had their entry completed using the two different methods is presumably biased for this year's reporting. More specifically, the children who had their entry rating completed using the old method (COSF), were in the program longer by circumstance, since everyone whose entry rating was completed in that manner exited within FFY15, but had been served in EI since prior to January of 2015. Those who had their entry rating completed using the new method (COS statements) exited within the same timeframe, but entered the program no earlier than January of 2015. Thus, those who had their entry ratings completed with the COSF entered EI at a younger age (461 days of age compared to 641 days for those with entry ratings using the COS statements, on average), exited at an older age (1,039 days of age compared to 927 days of age, on average), and were served longer (578 days compared to 287 days, on average). More importantly, because they entered EI at a younger age and were served longer, on average, those who had their entry ratings completed using the COSF were likely those with more severe delays, explaining at least some of the discrepancy in the entry ratings.

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

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

FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	96.00%	98.00%	99.00%	100%
Target B ≥	98.00%	99.00%	100%	100%
Target C ≥	97.00%	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 2015 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	1,477	1,574	93.84%
4B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	1,497	1,573	95.17%
4C. Help their children develop and learn	1,488	1,575	94.48%

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

Tool Used to Gather Family Outcomes Data

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

Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on July 1, 2016 were identified as potential recipients. DODD mailed the surveys to families the first week of October 2016 and surveys were due back by October 28th, 2016. 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 last year, 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 paper 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.

Questionnaire Response

Of 9,866 families who were identified as having children being served on July 1, 2016, a total of 9,539 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 1,579 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 16.55%. Eighty-six of Ohio's eighty-eight counties were represented in the responses to the Family Questionnaire. The following table outlines the methods families used to respond to the questionnaire:

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents' Response Type

Response Method	Number	Percent
Mail	1,394	88.28%
Web	185	11.72%
Total	1,579	100%

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, 2016.

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Comparison

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	0.43%	0	0.00%	34	0.36%
Asian	178	2.24%	25	1.58%	203	2.13%
Black	1,176	14.77%	116	7.35%	1,292	13.54%
Hispanic	369	4.64%	61	3.86%	430	4.51%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	22	0.28%	0	0.00%	22	0.23%
Two or More Races	419	5.26%	59	3.74%	478	5.01%
White	5,762	72.39%	1318	83.47%	7,080	74.22%
Total	7,960	100.00%	1,579	100.00%	9,539	100.00%

Table 3: Child Age Category

Age Category	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 to 1	999	12.55%	194	12.29%	1,193	12.51%
1 to 2	2,475	31.09%	519	32.87%	2,994	31.39%
2 to 3	4,486	56.36%	866	54.84%	5,352	56.11%
Total	7,960	100.00%	1,579	100.00%	9,539	100.00%

In regard to race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, with White families slightly overrepresented and Black respondents slightly underrepresented. To ensure representativeness among respondents, Ohio will perform extra outreach to underrepresented groups, including re-sending surveys if necessary. Age categories of respondents were comparable to those of all children served on July 1st, 2016.

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

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

FFY 2015– FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.30%	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 2015 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data
1,355	139,055	0.97%

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

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

FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.80%	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 2015 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data
10,195	416,763	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

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target	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%

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2015 Data
731	769	95.06%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	236
--	-----

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 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 2015. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) 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 January 1, 2016 and March 31, 2016 were included in Ohio's FFY15 45-Day analysis. Of the 769 child records examined, 731 (95.06 percent) were compliant. A total of seven findings were issued to seven EIS programs upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were issued in FFY16 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

The 731 child records counted as being compliant include 236 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 236 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

Ten 45-Day findings were due for correction in FFY15, six of which were based on FFY13 data and reported in the FFY13 APR and four of which were based on FY14 data and reported in the FFY14 APR, but all of which were identified and issued in FFY14. All ten findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. ODH 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 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Ten findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY15, six of which were based on FFY13 data and reported in the FFY13 APR and four of which were based on FFY14 data and reported in the FFY14 APR, but all of which were issued in FFY14. All ten findings were corrected in a timely manner. All were verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. ODH 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 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. These memos were issued very shortly after noncompliance was identified. Once findings of noncompliance are issued, the state extracts data from the State data system and monitors local program progress on the indicator on a monthly basis.

For findings issued prior to January 2015, the specific conditions around when records were requested for verification to ensure local programs were correctly implementing each regulatory requirement varied slightly based on the local program's baseline compliance percentage, as follows:

- If a local program was between 90% and 99% compliant for the baseline analysis, when one month of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested
- If a local program was between 80% and 89% compliant for the baseline analysis, when two consecutive months of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested
- If a local program was below 80% compliant for the baseline analysis, they were required to submit a Corrective Action Plan; additionally, when two consecutive months of data appeared to be 100% compliant at face value, child records were requested

Ohio simplified its correction process beginning in 2015. For findings issued from then forward, the conditions around when records are requested for verification and counties go on a CAP are the same:

- DODD examines data on a monthly basis to determine county compliance. Data are pulled on or just after the first of each month and counties receive missing data inquiries, as necessary.
- In order to correct any findings, counties 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 county does not correct within six monthly data analyses, the county will go on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).
- If a county 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 approaches, the state verified a randomly selected, representative sample of child records from each local program to ensure that for each child, hearing and vision screenings were completed, eligibility was determined, child and family assessments were completed, and an IFSP was developed within 45 days of referral to Early Intervention, 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 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 programs as follows:

- **Clermont** (FFY13 data): 10 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in September 2014
- **Clinton** (FFY13 data): 11 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in January and February 2015
- **Gallia** (FFY13 data): 4 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending November and December 2014
- **Jefferson** (FFY13 data): 3 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in December 2014 and January 2015
- **Lawrence** (FFY13 data): 7 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in November and December 2014
- **Wayne** (FFY13 data): 13 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in February and March 2015
- **Athens** (FFY14 data): 8 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 2015
- **Coshocton** (FFY14 data): 5 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 2015
- **Licking** (FFY14 data): 17 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in June and July 2015
- **Wyandot** (FFY14 data): 2 records verified; 45-Day timelines ending in March and April 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 components required to be completed within 45 days were completed, albeit late, or that the child was subsequently exited from EI.

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

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

8A Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target	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%

FFY 2015- FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

8A FFY 2015 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 2015 Data
268	272	98.53%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	5
--	---

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 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 2015. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. A representative sample from each of the 28 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between April 1, 2016 and June 30, 2016 was included in Ohio's FFY15 Transition Steps analysis. Of the 272 child records examined, 268 (98.53 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS program upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were issued in FFY16 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

The 268 child records counted as being compliant include 5 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 5 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were no Steps and Services findings due for correction in FFY15. One finding was reported in Ohio's FFY14 APR for this indicator; however, this finding was identified and issued in FFY15 and thus the status of correction will be reported in Ohio's FFY16 APR.

8B Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target	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%

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

8B FFY 2015 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 2015 Data
5,076	5,076	100%

Describe the method used to collect these data

Ohio EIS programs are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA by February 1st; May 1st; August 1st; and November 1st each year, that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as

long as the family provides consent to share information. Although the report due dates do not correspond to a state or federal fiscal year, because each report includes all children who will be turning three within a year of the report due date, the state ensures that, over the course of the four report submissions, LEAs are notified 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 at least the past six 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, 2016 were generated using Ohio's statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2016 and January 31, 2017 who were potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (435 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). Of 5,076 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 5,076.

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. In addition to ensuring notification to the LEA occurred as required, Ohio ensured the SEA was informed of all 5,076 children for the February 1, 2016 reporting date in a timely manner, as well as for each quarterly reporting date throughout the fiscal year.

For FFY14, the lead agency ensured local programs provided notification to the LEA as required, but the state continued to collaborate with the SEA in order to implement a plan for providing the quarterly data for all children turning age three to the SEA at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. A plan was put in place and the lead agency has been notifying the SEA of required children on a quarterly basis as of the beginning of FFY15. The state reported 0% for this indicator for FFY14 due to the lack of notification to the SEA only; all local EIS programs provided notification to the LEAs as required. Thus, the state issued no findings to local EIS programs based on FFY14 data. Therefore, there were no LEA/SEA findings due for correction in FFY15.

8C Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target	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%

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

8C FFY 2015 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	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data
--	--	---------------

nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B		
573	575	99.65%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	34
--	----

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. 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 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 2015. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between April 1, 2016 and June 30, 2016 were included in Ohio's FFY15 Transition Planning Conference analysis. Of the 575 child records examined, 573 (99.65 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS program upon completion of the baseline analysis; these findings were issued in FFY16 and therefore the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY17 APR.

The 573 child records counted as being compliant include 34 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 34 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were no TPC findings due for correction in FFY15. One finding for this indicator was reported in the FFY14 APR; however this finding was identified and issued in FFY15 and thus the status of correction will be reported in the FFY16 APR.

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

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Data	N/A									

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2015 Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0

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

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥		82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	93.00%	N/A	N/A
Data	100%	100%	100%	50.00%	100%	N/A - no mediations				

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

FFY 2015 Data

FFY 2015 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 2015 Data
0	0	0	0