

OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013– June 30, 2014)

Submitted January 29, 2015



Introduction

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 our Ohio Administrative Code, 3701-8. More specifically, we define who can be an Early Intervention Service Coordination contractor, responsible for all Early Intervention coordination, in OAC 3701-8-02. We outline the state's monitoring and enforcement of sanctions for these contractors in OAC 3701-8-02.1. All dispute resolution rights for parents and responsibilities for contractors are described in OAC 3701-8-10, 3701-8-10.1, and 3701-8-10.2. The rules communicate how the Lead Agency in Ohio (The Ohio Department of Health, ODH) expects and requires local Early Intervention programs to practice and the sanctions we will take if noncompliance is identified.

In addition to these rules, Ohio also utilizes its website and monthly calls to provide reminders of the requirements under IDEA Part C to providers of Early Intervention in the state. Technical assistance consultants also provide reminders through various communication methodologies including e-mail, conference call, webinar, on-site training and on-site focused technical assistance about the requirements directly to local EI programs.

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 (including Transition Planning Conference and Steps monitoring, as notification to the LEA is monitored for every local program every year).

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.

Technical assistance is provided by both the Lead Agency (ODH) and its EI System Partner, the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD). Early Intervention program consultants sit at both state agencies and provide timely, high quality technical assistance to all 88 Ohio county-based EI programs. Monthly calls are conducted with the field of Early Intervention to provide information, guidance, and answers to questions asked by participants. These calls are recorded and are accompanied by a handout which provides the information discussed. Call handouts and recordings are available via our program website located at www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov.

In addition to the monthly calls, Early Intervention staff also prepare and conduct topic-specific webinars and conference calls, as needed. DODD consultants have spent the past year conducting webinars on the Evaluation & Assessment processes in Early Intervention for all 88 Ohio county EI programs. They have coupled this webinar with an analysis of each county's processes, record review, and on-site technical assistance visits to educate, inform, and support movement to processes which will best support EI families and providers to accomplish IFSP outcomes.

DODD and ODH have divided the technical assistance work by topic, so that each EI program has at least one ODH and DODD consultant to go to for help and guidance. We work together to deliver one message to the field and provide trainings which include program consultants from each agency. The ODH provides the grant money to the local EI programs and thus provides 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 provide technical assistance which focuses on evaluation and assessment, IFSP outcomes development, and service provision. Both agencies participate 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.

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.

The professional development system in Ohio is in a state of exciting transition. Recently, OAC 3701-8-03 was revised to include a tiered credential for Service Coordinators (SCs), which will better allow the state to transition SCs from introductory trainings to advanced and mastery of the role, commensurate with pay increases. The training and technical assistance system which surround our SCs is being re-scaffolded in order to support their professional development and move away from the common misperception that they are not professionals. Along with our DODD and Developmental Disabilities Council partners, the state has prioritized training and professional development for SCs to include their role as Service Coordinators, their role on an EI Service Team, and their role in the development and review of IFSPs during this past federal fiscal year. These targeted opportunities for professional development will continue while we develop other trainings to support SCs and other service providers in the field of Early Intervention. Also under development are a series of targeted modules for EI service providers which focus on IDEA, Part C laws and regulations, teaming, and writing functional IFSP outcomes, as well as financing in Early Intervention, child outcomes, and transition-specific topics.

Ohio ensures that service providers are effectively providing high quality services through our monitoring system components like record review and data system analyses, but also through the use of pre and post testing during self-learning opportunities; training evaluations; regional community forums to hear what is needed from Service Coordinators; and presenting at every opportunity to Professional Discipline Associations (OTs, PTs, CBDD providers) and other stakeholder groups.

All credentialing of Service Coordinators, their Supervisors, and Developmental Specialists is done at either ODH or DODD. Service Coordinators and their Supervisors input their professional development hours, trainings, certifications, and other qualifications into a statewide Early Childhood Professional database called the Ohio Professional Registry (www.opdn.org) and an independent vendor validates their training contact hours for each and every initial and renewal credential (required every two calendar years).

In addition, Ohio just moved its measurement of Child Outcomes into its statewide IFSP, which went into effect January 15, 2015. With a Child Outcomes-integrated IFSP, training for the new form has included the philosophy and practice for completing Child Outcomes measures in a valid and reliable way. Parents and providers will not rely on numbers to rank children relative to their same age peers, but narrative statements which they can then utilize in the development of functional, contextualized, measurable, and meaningful IFSP outcomes and progress reviews.

Finally, we believe that the professional development system must remain critical of itself, stay fresh with the research and data coming out of Early Intervention, and change to address new challenges which arise while maintaining the support the EI professionals need to do their best job for the families they serve. By building a professional development scaffolding up around our Service Coordinators and service providers, we put the pieces in place to have the greatest impact. By monitoring and supervising through continuous quality improvement analyses, we ensure the link between professional development and practice is strong and responsive to the needs.

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 monthly calls, public postings inviting input and feedback, quarterly State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meetings, monthly conference calls with an additional EI Stakeholder group, and workgroups as needed. Every month, the Lead Agency (ODH) creates a handout and conducts a call, with an opportunity to ask questions. Between 75 and 200 locations participate on these calls every month and for those who cannot, the call is recorded and placed on the homepage of the program website (www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov). The calls announce opportunities for 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 for a minimum of sixty calendar days. Announcements go out widely via our email blasts, web page, and social media accounts to EI providers, parents, and stakeholders, as well as grantees, service providers, County Boards of Developmental Disabilities, and Regional Infant Hearing Program providers.

In addition to these electronic communication strategies, the Lead Agency (ODH) and partners at DODD engage numerous workgroups, including the SICC and a larger, more diverse EI Stakeholder group in monthly calls and quarterly in-person meetings to discuss any business in Early Intervention which needs input, feedback, advisement, or assistance. The EI Stakeholder group includes the SICC members and has been discussing targets for this APR submission since May 12, 2014. Meeting minutes and agendas reflect the broad input and discussion at each meeting, resulting in agreement on targets at the November 2014 meeting.

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. It was agreed that all compliance indicator targets would be set at the required 100%. Target methodologies, or different ways we could set the targets was 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 were 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.

Reporting to the Public

How the State will report annually to the public on the performance of EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but not later than 120 days following the State's submission of its APR as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

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 eighty-eight EI program reports on the program website (www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY 2012 reports are located here: <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/Early%20Intervention/countycards/countycards.aspx> and the FFY 2013 reports will be added by June 2015.

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
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		72.37%	96.80%	98.78%	94.06%	98.59%	98.71%	99.36%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2013 Data
1,433	1,491	96.11%

The FFY 2013 data is calculated: “Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner” divided by “Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs”

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator (check one)?

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 Indicator 8 A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle which assures an even selection of EIS programs each FY for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators and representativeness of EIS programs and children/families served with each Indicator each FY. The compliance analysis schedule spans several years and the indicator analyzed is constantly varied for each county, as is the time period for which data are examined. After being part of an analysis for an indicator four times, a county will have had data from all four quarters analyzed for that indicator.

Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2013. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between October 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 were included in Ohio’s FFY13 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 1,433 child records counted as being compliant include 130 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 130 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. A total of eight findings were issued to eight EIS programs, which were issued during FFY14.

Six Timely Receipt of Services findings were due for correction in FFY13, 3 of which were based on FFY11 data and reported in the FFY11 APR, and 3 of which were based on FFY12 data and reported in the FFY12 APR. All 6 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.

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between October 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 were included in Ohio’s FFY13 TRS analysis.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of one quarter of the data is representative of the counties’ compliance for the entire fiscal year.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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.

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

Six findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY13, all of which were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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
Target ≥		78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
Data	83.91%	86.47%	88.32%	90.24%	91.06%	83.33%	83.93%	80.70%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	81.00%	85.00%	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 2013 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 2013 Data
8,181	10,221	80.04%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings" divided by "Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs"

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.10%
	Data				63.02%	60.44%	59.07%	55.33%	57.60%
A2	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	61.70%	63.40%
	Data				63.34%	62.10%	66.81%	66.65%	65.76%
B1	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%
	Data				62.85%	62.41%	59.27%	56.81%	58.33%
B2	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%
	Data				62.93%	62.10%	66.89%	61.20%	60.43%
C1	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	61.30%	62.60%
	Data				62.50%	60.98%	59.21%	62.58%	63.50%
C2	Target ≥					60.00%	60.00%	62.00%	63.60%
	Data				63.49%	61.85%	67.57%	64.88%	64.28%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target A2 ≥	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Target B1 ≥	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target B2 ≥	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target C1 ≥	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target C2 ≥	64.00%	65.00%	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 2013 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	4,889
---	-------

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

	Number of children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	237
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	998
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	595
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,115
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,944

Outcome	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 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 <i>Expected calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	1,710	2,945	58.06%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program <i>Expected calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	3,059	4,889	62.57%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	270
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,090
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	713
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,292
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,524

Outcome	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program <i>Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,005	3,365	59.58%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program <i>Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,816	4,889	57.60%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	217
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,012
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	680
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,456
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,524

Outcome	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program <i>Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,136	3,365	63.48%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program <i>Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,980	4,889	60.95%

Was sampling used (Y/N)? **N**

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) (Y/N)? **N**

If not, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The child’s IFSP team including the child’s family used a variety of data sources to make a determination of the child’s performance level. The child’s performance was scored using a seven (7)-point scale included on the adapted COSF originally developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. ODH used the recommended OSEP Categories Calculator provided by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center to determine progress categories for the COSF and has adapted the Early Childhood Outcomes Center’s definition for “comparable to same-aged peers”, as a child who has been scored as a six (6) or seven (7) on the seven (7)-point scale included on the COSF.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The FFY 2012 response table here: <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partbspap/allyears.html>. Download it to determine if action is required for this indicator.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The FFY12 Response table included the following required action for this indicator: “The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.” We have reported on the progress and target data above, thus meeting this requirement.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	Target ≥		92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
	Data		94.53%	95.76%	93.76%	92.80%	86.36%	86.33%	93.22%
B	Target ≥		92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
	Data		94.74%	96.07%	94.26%	95.02%	92.23%	91.91%	96.04%
C	Target ≥		92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
	Data		93.39%	94.84%	91.81%	93.70%	91.15%	90.73%	95.27%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.00%	95.00%	96.00%	98.00%	99.00%	100%
Target B ≥	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	99.00%	100%	100%
Target C ≥	95.00%	96.00%	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 2013 Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	2,733
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,510
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,713
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,567
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,720
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,571
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,722

Outcome	FFY 2013 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights <i>(a divided by the number of respondent families participating in Part C)</i>	92.52% (2,510/2,713)
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs <i>(b divided by the number of respondent families participating in Part C)</i>	94.38% (2,567/2,720)
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn <i>(c divided by the number of respondent families participating in Part C)</i>	94.45% (2,571/2,722)

Was sampling used (Y/N)? **Y**

If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed (Y/N)? **N**

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The population for families selected for the administration of the Family Questionnaire included all families with an active IFSP on May 1, 2014.

The Ohio Department of Health used a modified version of the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's Family Outcome Questionnaire (ECO). Three 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 has helped me know my rights.
2. Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child's needs.
3. Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow.

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.

Regarding representativeness, as mentioned above, in terms of race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, with White families slightly overrepresented and Black or African American families, Hispanic families, and families with a child identified as being of two or more races somewhat underrepresented. Respondents were representative of the entire population in regards to age.

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Was a collection tool used (Y/N)? **Y**

If so, is it a new or revised collection tool (Y/N)? **N**

Does the data accurately represent the demographics of the State? **Y**

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 Health used a modified version of the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) Family Outcomes Questionnaire. Three 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 has helped me know my rights.
2. Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child's needs.
3. Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow.

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 was substituted for Part C throughout the questionnaire as that is how families "know" Part C in Ohio.
- The survey format was redesigned to fit onto one page
- The verbiage of the survey was changed to bring it to a 5th grade reading level
- The adapted OSEP items (Help Me Grow has helped me know my rights; Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child's needs; and Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow) were the first questions on the questionnaire rather than dispersed throughout the survey as they are on the latest OSEP version of the questionnaire.
- ODH used most of the other questions on the questionnaire, but some were deleted (see attached HMG Family Outcomes Questionnaire).

Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on May 1, 2014 were identified as potential recipients. In an effort to continue to improve response rates, Ohio implemented the following strategies in its administration of the family questionnaires:

- Sending out postcards prior administering the survey to remind families the questionnaire would be coming soon;
- As was done last year, the sample of families surveyed was increased by utilizing a date for sampling closer to the survey distribution period than in past years, as well as 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.
- Families were provided the option to respond to the questionnaire via mailing to ODH or by completing it online.
- ODH mailed out the reminder postcards on August 22, 2014 to let families know the survey would be arriving soon. The surveys were mailed to families on September 19, 2014.

Questionnaire Response

Of 9,592 families who were identified as having children being served on May 1, 2014, a total of 9,143 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). The Ohio Department of Health received 2,733 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 29.89% percent. Eighty-seven of Ohio's eighty-eight counties were represented in the responses to the Family Outcomes 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	2,605	95.3%
Web	128	4.7%
Total	2,733	100%

Respondent Representativeness

The following tables provide a comparison of the race/ethnicity and age categories between the respondents of the questionnaire and all children who were being served on May 1, 2013 at the time of distribution, on September 19, 2014:

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	0.4%	8	0.3%	32	0.3%
Asian	124	1.9%	50	1.8%	174	1.9%
Black	1,097	16.9%	197	7.2%	1,294	14.0%
Hispanic	285	4.4%	74	2.7%	359	3.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	15	0.2%	7	0.3%	22	0.2%
Two or More Races	336	5.2%	105	3.8%	441	4.8%
White	4,598	71.0%	2,292	83.9%	6,890	74.8%
Total	6,479	100%	2,733	100%	9,212	100%

Table 3: Child Age Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents

Age Category	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 to 1	415	6.4%	201	7.4%	616	6.7%
1 to 2	1,724	26.6%	689	25.2%	2,413	26.2%
2 to 3	4,340	67.0%	1,843	67.4%	6,183	67.1%
Total	6,479	100%	2,733	100%	9212	100%

In terms of race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, with White families slightly overrepresented and Black or African American families, Hispanic families, and families with a child identified as being of two or more races somewhat underrepresented. Respondents were representative of the entire population in regards to age.

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
Target ≤		1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%	1.60%
Data	1.38%	1.43%	1.66%	1.8%	1.75%	1.86%	1.76%	1.19%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.20%	1.20%	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 2013 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data
1,392	135,733	1.03%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs" divided by "Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1"

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
Target ≤		2.40%	2.60%	2.80%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	3.10%
Data	2.50%	2.64%	2.97%	3.29%	3.21%	3.49%	3.36%	2.70%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.70%	2.70%	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 2013 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data
10,221	410,373	2.49%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs" divided by "Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3"

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
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	N/A	73.80%	94.42%	93.79%	97.52%	98.67%	99.09%	95.15%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2013 Data
972	1,014	95.86%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "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" divided by "Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted"

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator (check one)?

State monitoring
Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.
<p>For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicator 8 A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle which assures an even selection of EIS programs each FY for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators and representativeness of EIS programs and children/families served with each Indicator each FY. The compliance analysis schedule spans several years and the indicator analyzed is constantly varied for each county, as is the time period for which data are examined. After being part of an analysis for an indicator four times, a county will have had data from all four quarters analyzed for that indicator.</p> <p>Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2013. 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 April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014 were included in Ohio's FFY13 45 Day analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which all</p>

children with 45 Day timelines ending between January 1, 2014 and March 31, 2014 were examined). Of the 1,014 child records examined, 972 (95.86 percent) were compliant. A total of 6 findings were issued to 6 EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY14.

The 972 child records counted as being compliant includes 185 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 185 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

Seven 45 Day findings were due for correction in FFY13, all of which were based on FFY11 data and reported in the FFY11 APR. All 7 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.

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had 45 Day timelines ending between April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014 were included in Ohio’s FFY13 45 Day analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which all children with 45 Day timelines ending between January 1, 2014 and March 31, 2014 were examined).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of one quarter of the data is representative of the counties’ compliance for the entire fiscal year.

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 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
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.03%	98.76%	97.50%	97.64%	99.22%	99.31%	100%

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8A FFY 2013 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 2013 Data
228	231	98.70%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C"

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator (check one)?

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 Indicator 8 A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle which assures an even selection of EIS programs each FY for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators and representativeness of EIS programs and children/families served with each Indicator each FY. The compliance analysis schedule spans several years and the indicator analyzed is constantly varied for each county, as is the time period for which data are examined. After being part of an analysis for an indicator four times, a county will have had data from all four quarters analyzed for that indicator.

8B FFY 2013 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 2013 Data
4,983	4,987	99.92%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "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" divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B"

Number of parents who opted out	404
---------------------------------	-----

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA. (Y/N) N

If you answer "no" to this question, please provide an explanation.

ODH ensures notification to the LEA occurs as required, but continues 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.

Describe the method used to collect these data

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from local Help Me Grow EI programs. Reports were generated using Ohio's statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2013 and January 31, 2014 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (404 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 3 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 ODH for the February 1 report, which we used for our compliance analysis. As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of the data from one of the required quarterly reports is presumed to represent the counties' compliance for the entire fiscal year.

8B Required Actions

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table *not including correction of noncompliance*

Required Actions: The State did not provide valid and reliable FFY 2012 data based on the required measurement. The State must provide valid and reliable data based on the required measurement for this indicator for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

In the FFY12 APR, Ohio reported that the measurement for this indicator did not reflect all of the requirements. The LEAs were informed of all children turning three quarterly; however, ODH reported that the LEAs were not always informed of these children at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. Additionally, ODH also reported that there was not a process in place to assure that every child is made known to the SEA at least 90 calendar days before their third birthday.

Upon further examination, ODH realized we were and are meeting the reporting requirement of informing the LEA at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, as local EI programs are required to send reports to the LEAs each quarter that inform them of all children turning three within the entire next year.

Furthermore, ODH continues 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.

8B Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			89.32%	94.37%	97.64%	97.78%	99.32%	99.04%

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8C FFY 2013 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data
355	368	96.47%

FFY 2013 data is calculated: "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B"

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator (Check one)?

State monitoring
Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.
<p>For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicator 8 A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle which assures an even selection of EIS programs each FY for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators and representativeness of EIS programs and children/families served with each Indicator each FY. The compliance analysis schedule spans several years and the indicator analyzed is constantly varied for each county, as is the time period for which data are examined. After being part of an analysis for an indicator four times, a county will have had data from all four quarters analyzed for that indicator.</p> <p>Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2013. 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 Transition Planning Conferences due between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013 were included in Ohio's FFY13 Transition Planning Conference analysis. Of the 368 child records examined, 355 (96.47 percent) were compliant. A total of 5 findings were issued to 5 EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY13.</p> <p>The 355 child records counted as being compliant include 25 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 25 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.</p> <p>There were no findings due for correction in FFY13 for this indicator.</p>

State database
Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).
All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013 were included in Ohio's FFY13 Transition Planning Conference analysis.
Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.
As the requirements for the indicators are always the same, a sample of one quarter of the data is representative of the counties' compliance for the entire fiscal year.

8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 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
Target ≥		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	N/A							

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A - The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	N/A (none to resolution)

The FFY 2013 data is calculated: “3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements” divided by “3.1 Number of resolutions sessions”

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
Target ≥		82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	93.00%
Data	100%	100%	100%	50.00%	100%	N/A - no mediations	N/A - no mediations	N/A - no mediations

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A - The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 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 2013 Data
0	0	0	0

The FFY 2013 data is calculated: (“2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints” + “2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints”) divided by “2.1 Number of mediations held”

**ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION OF THE
INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL
UNDER PART C OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)**

Under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 CFR §303.604(c), the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) of each jurisdiction that receives funds under Part C of the IDEA must prepare and submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and to the Governor of its jurisdiction an annual report on the status of the early intervention programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families operated within the State. The ICC may either: (1) prepare and submit its own annual report to the Department and the Governor, or (2) provide this certification with the State lead agency's Annual Performance Report (APR)¹ under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the annual report or APR) is due no later than February 2, 2015.

On behalf of the ICC of the State/jurisdiction of The State of Ohio, I hereby certify that the ICC is: [please check one]

1. Submitting its own annual report for FFY 2013 (which is attached); or
2. Using the State's Part C APR for FFY 2013 in lieu of submitting the ICC's own annual report. By completing this certification, the ICC confirms that it has reviewed the State's Part C APR for accuracy and completeness.²

I hereby further confirm that a copy of this Annual Report Certification and the annual report or APR has been provided to our Governor.



Signature of ICC Chairperson

1/27/2015

Date

Kimberly Travers

905 Hampton Drive

Macedonia, OH 44056-1923

Address or e-mail

330-908-3107

Daytime telephone number

¹ Under IDEA Sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) and 642 and under 34 CFR §80.40, the lead agency's APR must report on the State's performance under its State performance plan and contain information about the activities and accomplishments of the grant period for a particular Federal fiscal year (FFY).

² If the ICC is using the State's Part C APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in the State's Part C APR, the ICC must attach to this certification an explanation of the ICC's disagreement and submit the certification and explanation no later than February 2, 2015.



Directions: We want to know if Help Me Grow has been helpful to your family. Fill in the circle that matches how you feel about each statement. Skip any of the items you do not want to answer. All answers are kept anonymous. If responses are shared, no identifying information will be included. If you have any questions, please feel free to call the state office at (614) 644-8389. Thank you for filling this out, we greatly appreciate it.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Help Me Grow has helped me know my rights.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child's needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I am comfortable participating in meetings with Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I have helped develop my family's IFSP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Help Me Grow has helped me find opportunities to meet and interact with other families.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Help Me Grow has treated me with respect.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I am satisfied with the help that Help Me Grow has given me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I am able to see my child making progress in Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I know what to do to file a complaint about Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional Comments:

When you have finished the survey, choose one of the following ways to give us your answers:

- Mail Help Me Grow the survey in the included envelope. OR
- Go online to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/HMGFQ2014> and answer the survey, using the ID at top of this page.