



# OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

246 North High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

614/466-3543  
[www.odh.ohio.gov](http://www.odh.ohio.gov)

John R. Kasich / Governor

Theodore E. Wymyslo, M.D. / Director of Health

May 17, 2013

United States Department of Education  
Office of Special Education Programs  
[OSERS.capr@ed.gov](mailto:OSERS.capr@ed.gov)

Attached is Ohio's Revised Annual Performance Report for the period July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (FFY 2011).

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the APR which we submitted on February 15, 2013. We have clarified previously submitted information on the technical assistance accessed due to our state determination as well as data for Indicators 1, 7, 8, and 9. Changes were highlighted as requested and can be found on the following pages:

Accessed Technical Assistance: Revised APR, page 2

Indicator 1: Revised APR, pages 3 and 4

Indicator 7: Revised APR, page 20

Indicator 8 A, B, & C: Revised APR, pages 22 - 24

Indicator 9: Revised APR, page 29

Ohio made no to its State Performance Plan, and therefore was not re-submitted during this clarification period. The SPP can be found on our state website here:

<http://www.ohiohelpmegrow.org/~media/HelpMeGrow/ASSETS/Files/Professionals%20Gallery/HMG%20Program%20Information/Federal%20Documents/FFY11%20State%20Performance%20Plan%20SPP%20as%20revised%20February%202013.ashx>

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me by phone at 614-728-9152 or email at [wendy.grove@odh.ohio.gov](mailto:wendy.grove@odh.ohio.gov).

Sincerely,

Wendy Grove, Ph.D.  
Ohio's Part C Coordinator  
Ohio Department of Health

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

FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)

REVISED May 17, 2013



**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by the Ohio Department of Health, Bureau for Children with Developmental and Special Health Needs, the lead agency for Early Intervention (EI) in Ohio. Much of the data for the APR were captured and extracted from the statewide electronic data system, Early Track (ET), as well as self-assessment reporting by the early intervention service (EIS) providers. The lead agency’s data team analyzed the data for the APR and created the data tables and summaries of the data. For some of Ohio’s FFY11 compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicator 8. Ohio has chosen to use a monitoring cycle which assures an even selection of EIS programs each FY for one of the aforementioned Indicators; moreover, the monitoring cycle is designed to assure representativeness of EIS programs and children/families served with each Indicator each FY.

To fulfill the public reporting requirement, Ohio’s APR and SPP were posted on the homepage at [www.ohiohelpmegrow.org](http://www.ohiohelpmegrow.org) under the “News” section from December 24, 2012 to February 4, 2013. Both documents are now available at the “Federal Reporting” page of the website, located at <http://www.ohiohelpmegrow.org/aboutus/reporting.aspx>.

The performance of each county Help Me Grow program in meeting the state targets are posted on the website. In addition, the regularly scheduled monthly call will include information about these performance reports.

Because Ohio was determined as “Needs Assistance” with its FFY 2010 state determination letter, the state’s EI lead agency must identify the sources of technical assistance that were received and the actions Ohio took as a result of the TA received. Indicator nine (9), with a compliance percentage of 77%, placed Ohio into the Needs Assistance category for FFY 2010. As required, the table below indicates the sources of technical assistance accessed and the resulting state actions for this indicator:

<b>State Determinations TA Accessed &amp; Resulting State Actions</b>	
Indicator 9: Timely correction of non-compliance (100% of identified findings of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification).	
<b>Sources of TA Accessed</b>	<b>Resulting State Actions</b>
Lead Agency Administration accessed the 45-Day Corrective Action Plan to Address Systemic Non-Compliance template	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adapted the template for Ohio</li> <li>Integrated the Ohio 45-Day CAP into the monitoring system process</li> <li>Wrote processes for when to use the 45-Day CAP</li> <li>Implemented processes with identified non-compliance programs statewide</li> </ul>
Lead Agency Administration listened to SPP/APR call and accessed the webinar slides on August 12, 2010 on “Identification and Correction of Non-Compliance in Part C”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implemented the multi-step process now being used for identification of non-compliance at the EI program level</li> <li>Implemented and refined the processes now in place in Ohio for verifying correction of non-compliance</li> </ul>
Accessed the NECTAC indicator analyses for Indicator 9 ( <a href="http://www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partbspap/2011">www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partbspap/2011</a> ) to examine national aggregated results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared to report out to SICC on the performance of Ohio compared to other states on this indicator</li> </ul>

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 1:** 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)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Twenty-nine EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2011. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children served by these EIS programs who also had services added to IFSPs during the December 2, 2011 to March 1, 2012 timeframe were examined electronically. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. 842 of the 853 children examined, or 98.7 percent, were compliant, as a result of occurring within 30 days of the signed IFSP. A total of three findings were issued to three EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY12, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY13 APR.

The 842 child records counted as being compliant includes 63 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 63 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

The 11 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 9 (82 percent) for data/documentation errors
- 1 (9 percent) for staff oversight/error
- 1 (9 percent) for provider availability

**Timely Receipt of Services Findings Issued During FFY11**

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2010	8
FFY 2011	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Though Ohio did not meet its target of 100%, 98.7 percent indicates improvement from the 98.6 percent compliance reported for FFY10. Six findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY11, 5 of which were corrected in a timely manner and the last one has since been corrected, all 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. Improvement can be attributed to rigorous monitoring at the state and local levels. At the local level, EIS providers can self monitor using a variety of reports available in the state’s electronic data system. Moreover, a staff of program consultants follows up on any identified non-compliance with on-site training, technical assistance, and site visits.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 1	Timeline	Resources
1. Continue to monitor this indicator via ODH’s web-based data system, Early Track, and on site focused monitoring visits.	Ongoing	ODH data and monitoring teams and state partners
2. ODH will provide technical assistance to counties who are identified with noncompliance in this area.	Ongoing	ODH HMG technical assistance team

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** Updated improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 2:** 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)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>83% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** 83.9 percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily received early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children. In the same manner as FFY 2010, ODH calculated the settings percentage by examining the services listed on the IFSP and calculating primary setting based upon which setting accounted for most total time in

## APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

service delivery. Using this methodology, ODH determined that 11,837 of the total 14,103 children received early intervention services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2011:** Not required, in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 2	Timeline	Improvement Activities for Indicator 2
1. Change Medicaid state plan to help finance early intervention services.	FFY 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODJFS</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ Governor's Office of Early Childhood Education</li> </ul>
2. Develop an implementation plan to embed and integrate evidence-based Early Intervention practices into services throughout the statewide system.	FFY 2012 - 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ DODD</li> <li>➤ DD Council</li> </ul>
3. Identify providers of early intervention and related services and utilize them for ERAP services.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ DODD</li> <li>➤ County Boards of DD</li> <li>➤ Bureau for Children with Medical Handicaps (BCMH) program</li> <li>➤ ODE</li> <li>➤ Private providers</li> </ul>
4. Engage stakeholders to review the Evaluation & Assessment and IFSP processes in the state.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Stakeholders</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>
5. Propose ways to develop and enhance undergraduate and graduate coursework and curriculum that enhance understanding of relationship- and strength-based services in all areas of early intervention practice (early education, physical therapy, nursing, audiology, child development, family relations, psychology, etc.).	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ CSPD Committee</li> <li>➤ Preparation grants/Advisory Councils in Ohio</li> <li>➤ DD Council</li> <li>➤ DODD</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 3:** 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)

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** 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.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of

infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2011	<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>	
	1. 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	61.5%
	2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	61.7%
	<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>	
	1. 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	61.5%
	2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	61.5%
	<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>	
	1. 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	61.3%
	2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	62.0%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Program entry data are collected on children six months or older through the evaluation and/or assessment process, including screenings, parent feedback and observations of the child. EIS providers collect a Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) which was adapted for use by Ohio from the Early Child Outcome Center’s form and uses a seven (7)-point scale with ratings of six (6) and seven (7) being “comparable to same-aged peers.”

COSFs are entered electronically into Ohio’s statewide electronic data system.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	413	6.0%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,217	17.8%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	653	9.5%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,366	20.0%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,196	46.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=6,845</b>	<b>100%</b>

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	475	6.9%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,372	20.0%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	809	11.8%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,620	23.7%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,569	37.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=6,845</b>	<b>100%</b>

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	383	5.6%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,236	18.1%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	785	11.5%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,922	28.1%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,519	36.8%
<b>Total</b>	N=6,845	100%

Summary Statements	Percent of children
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>	
1. 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	55.3%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	66.6%
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>	
1. 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	56.8%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	61.2%
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>	
1. 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	62.6%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	64.9%

Measurement strategies to collect data

- Who are included in the measurement? All infants and toddlers who are served in the early intervention system for at least 6 months with an IFSP that qualifies for Entry COSF Ratings\*  
\*Children must have an IFSP in place in Ohio’s Part C program on/after six (6) months of age, and prior to thirty (30) months of age.
- What assessment / measurement tool(s) and/or other data sources will be used? The child’s IFSP team including the child’s family will use a variety of data sources to make a determination of the child’s performance level. The child’s performance will be scored using a seven (7)-point scale included on the adapted COSF originally developed by the Early Childhood Outcome Center.
- What data will be reported to the state, and how will the data be transmitted? Currently, on an ongoing basis, at entry (or IFSP review for children entering under six (6) months of age), each annual IFSP, and exit, local programs complete COSFs and related data entry into a web-based data collection system, Early Track.
- What data analysis methods will be used to determine the progress categories? ODH uses the recommended COSF to OSEP Categories Calculator provided by the Early Childhood Outcome Center.
- What criteria will be used to determine whether a child’s functioning was “comparable to same aged peers”? ODH has adapted the Early Childhood Outcome Center’s definition for “comparable to same-aged peers”, a child who has been scored as a six (6) or seven (7) on the seven (7)-point scale included on the COSF.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Ohio experienced improvement from FFY10 for Outcome C, Summary Statement 1, but experienced slippage for all of the other Family Outcomes indicators. Ohio did exceed the targets for the second Summary Statement for Outcome A and both Summary Statements for Outcomes C, but missed the targets for the other 3. Data reported under this indicator are more representative to Ohio’s program than in previous years in that we continue to see a larger proportion of exiting children have COSF data available. The difference in percentages between SS1 and SS2 for all outcomes are believed to be the result of this increasing representativeness, and the relationship between SS1 and SS2. Specifically, the subset of children reported in SS2 who enrolled at age expectations and maintained at age expectations are excluded from the calculation in SS1. Therefore, with more children included in the reporting period enrolling at age expectations and maintaining at age expectations the SS2 percentage increases and the number of records which could be considered in SS1 decreases.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 3	Timeline	Resources
1. Quality assurance on data to ensure accuracy & completeness. Support contracted agency staff in reviewing random samples of COSFs for quality & completeness.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> <li>➤ Contracted agency staff</li> <li>➤ SICC</li> </ul>
2. Analyze data summaries to look for discrepancies by county, service agency, service coordinator	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> <li>➤ Contracted agency staff</li> </ul>
3. Analyze outcomes of COSF update to Council and strategize on improvements to education, information, or/and process.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 4:** 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)

<b>Measurement:</b>	
A.	Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
B.	Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
C.	Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<p>A. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families <b>know their rights</b>.</p> <p>B. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families <b>effectively communicate their children's needs</b>.</p> <p>C. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families <b>help their children develop and learn</b>.</p>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Three questions from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Family Questionnaire were adapted for Ohio and used on a survey mailed to families in order to gather data for this indicator.

1. To what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family know and understand your rights?
2. To what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family effectively communicate your child's needs?
3. To what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family be able to help your child develop and learn?

Each question had a scale of 1 to 7 with the following anchors:

- 1 – Help Me Grow has done a poor job of helping us . . .
- 3 – Help Me Grow has done a fair job of helping us . . .
- 5 – Help Me Grow has done a good job of helping us . . .

7 – Help Me Grow has done an excellent job of helping us . . .  
Based on technical assistance from ECO, Ohio used responses of 5, 6, and 7 for each question to determine what families were helped by Help Me Grow in the three areas of this indicator.

### Tool Used to Gather Family Outcomes Data

The Ohio Department of Health used a modified version of the Early Childhood Center's Family Outcome Questionnaire. 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 OSEP questions (i.e., to what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family know and understand your rights?; to what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family effectively communicate your child's needs?; and to what extent has Help Me Grow helped your family be able to help your child develop and learn?) were the first questions on the questionnaire rather than the last questions.
- ODH used most of the other questions on the questionnaire to answer HMG Family Outcomes, but some questions were deleted (see attached HMG Family Outcomes Questionnaire).

This year, the survey produced the following data:

- 86.3 percent Know their rights:** 1,017 respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services helped them know their rights divided by 1,178 respondent families participating in Part C times 100. 11 non-responses were removed from the denominator. ODH received a total of 1,189 questionnaires; 1,178 included responses to the question referencing Indicator 4A.
- 91.9 percent Effectively communicate their children's needs:** 1,079 respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services helped them effectively communicate their children's needs divided by 1,174 respondent families participating in Part C times 100. 15 non-responses were removed from the denominator. ODH received a total of 1,189 questionnaires; 1,174 included responses to question referencing Indicator 4B.
- 90.7 percent Help their children develop and learn:** 1,076 respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn divided by 1,186 respondent families participating in Part C times 100. 3 non-responses were removed from the denominator. ODH received a total of 1,189 questionnaires; 1,186 included responses to question referencing Indicator 4C.

### Administration of the Questionnaire

Questionnaires were mailed to 4,402 families. In an effort to continue to improve response rates, Ohio implemented new strategies in its administration of the family questionnaires, these procedures included:

- Sending out postcards before administering the survey to remind families the questionnaire would be coming soon and to determine which addresses for families were incorrect;
- Asking local programs to instruct their service coordinators to encourage families to complete their questionnaires;

In order to improve the response rate from traditionally underrepresented populations, Ohio took the following steps:

- Translated the paper survey into Spanish and distributed the translated version to families whose primary caregiver was identified as primarily Spanish-speaking in Ohio's Part C program's data system.
- Ohio also provided multiple response options including online survey completion and telephone response.

The ODH mailed out the reminder postcards on August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012 to let families know the survey would be arriving soon. The surveys were mailed on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012 and included a cover letter as well as a return envelope already addressed to ODH. The ODH sent an e-mail to county program administrators with a list of survey recipients in their county, instructing them to encourage families who had not yet completed the questionnaire to do so. The cover letter included with the survey highlighted the following characteristics of the questionnaire:

- Completing the survey was completely voluntary;
- Responses would remain confidential
- Individual responses would not be shared and ODH reports data only in the aggregate;
- Family feedback is highly valued; and
- The timeline to return the survey was about 6 weeks.

Response

The cover letter gave families various options for submitting the completed questionnaire, including:

- Complete the hard copy questionnaire and return it to The Ohio Department of Health by mail using an enclosed addressed, stamped envelope.
- Complete the questionnaire on the Helpline website. Upon logging into the online survey site, families were prompted to enter their child’s Early Track Identification (ETID) number and then could answer the questionnaire.
- Call the HMG Helpline and respond to the questions via phone interview.

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents’ Response Type

<b>Response Method</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Inbound Calls	18	1.5%
Outbound Calls	16	1.3%
Mailed (Written Questionnaire)	1,038	87.3%
Internet	117	9.8%
Total	1,189	100.00%

Families still enrolled in the program at the time of distribution, beginning October 12, 2012 with a current Individualized Family Service Plan from the December 1, 2011 child count were identified for survey receipt. A total of 4,402 surveys were distributed. The Ohio Department of Health received 1,189 surveys for a response rate of 27.0 percent. Eighty-five of Ohio’s 88 counties were represented in the responses to the Family Outcomes questionnaire.

How representative is the sample of families being reported above?

**Demographic description of families who responded by race, age and sex:**

Table 2: Race and Ethnic Distribution of Children Represented by Questionnaire Respondents

Race/Ethnicity	Questionnaire Respondents	
Hispanic/Latino	28	2.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.1%
Asian	14	1.2%
Black or African American	113	9.5%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
White	997	83.9%
Two or More Races	36	3.0%
Total	1,189	100.0%

Table 3: Age Distribution of Children Represented by Questionnaire Respondents

Age Range	N	%
0-1	3	0.3%
1-2	482	40.5%
2-3	704	59.2%
Total	1,189	100.0%

Analysis of Representativeness of Response

For FFY 2011, Ohio used a census approach for questionnaire distribution. Families were eligible to be part of the questionnaire process if their family became eligible for Part C on or before December 1, 2011 and were still in the program and had a current IFSP during the distribution of questionnaires, which began on October 12, 2012. In using Ohio’s most recent 618 data for comparison, Tables Five, Six and Seven display representativeness in race/ethnicity, sex and age.

Table 4: Race and Ethnicity Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents and 618 Data

Race/Ethnicity	Questionnaire Respondents		618	
	N	%	N	%
Hispanic/Latino	28	2.4%	814	5.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.1%	14	0.1%
Asian	14	1.2%	180	1.3%
Black or African American	113	9.5%	2,503	17.7%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	16	0.1%
White	997	83.9%	10,036	71.2%
Two or More Races	36	3.0%	540	3.8%
Total	1,189	100.0%	14,103	100.0%

Table 5: Child Age Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents and 618 Data

Age Range	Questionnaire Respondents		618	
	N	%	N	%
0-1	3	0.3%	2,464	17.5%
1-2	482	40.5%	4,694	33.3%
2-3	704	59.2%	6,945	49.2%
Total	1,189	100.0%	14,103	100.0%

Survey results are skewed for age of children. Specifically, parents with children age 2 – 3 years old are over-represented in the survey results compared to the general Part C population in Ohio, per Ohio’s 618 tables. Consequently, survey respondents with children age 0 – 1 are under-represented, using the same population standard. The reasons for this disparity are due to the manner in which Ohio chose to select eligible families for the response pool. Ohio selected all families who were determined eligible for the Help Me Grow Early Intervention (Part C) program on or before December 1, 2011 and were still in the program during questionnaire distribution, which was completed in October 2012. Age of the respondents’ child was calculated based on the date of survey delivery, October 12, 2012. As a result, any child falling into the 0 – 1 category would have become eligible before December 1, 2011 and still been under one year old on October 12, 2012, which represents a very small population of families. These selection criteria were chosen to assure that each family had an adequate amount of time in the program in order to inform their responses to the survey.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:**

- A. 86.3 is consistent with the percent reported for FFY2010

## APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

- B. 91.9 percent demonstrates slippage from 92.2 percent reported for FFY2010
- C. 90.7 indicates slippage from 91.1% reported in FFY 2010

Ohio did not meet the target of 93% for any of the outcomes and the questionnaire response rate dropped slightly from FFY2010, from 29.3% to 27.0%. A short response timeframe and not asking service coordinators to hand deliver surveys appears to have impacted Ohio's response rate (from 40% to 29.3%). We believe the fewer respondents impacted the number of parents who responded positively to this indicator. As we continue to refine the methodology employed for the family survey, we expect to see progress in meeting and exceeding our targets.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 4	Timeline	Resources
1. Creation of an educational seminar series for families which will target parent's rights, parent involvement in decisions for services, and parent advocacy which will be delivered both in person and online.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ Family Information Network</li> <li>➤ Family Engagement committee of the Ohio Family and Children First Council</li> </ul>
2. Review survey data annually & process for distribution to determine areas for continuous improvement.	Annually & ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ HMG Evaluation committee</li> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> </ul>
3. Revise Parents Rights brochure.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Public Awareness/Child Find Committee</li> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> </ul>
4. Revise family support activities to implement the Part C review recommendation to assure the availability of family-to-family support statewide in a cost neutral manner.	FFY 2012 and 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ SICC</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	1.5% of infants and toddlers birth to age one year will have IFSPs.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** 1.76 percent of infants and toddlers birth to age one year had IFSPs for FFY2011. This percentage is calculated by dividing the 0 to 1 child count reported to Westat by the Ohio Department of Health (ODH) on February 1, 2012 of 2,464<sup>1</sup> and the 2011 population estimate of 139,712<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>[Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2011. Data updated as of July 15, 2012]

<sup>2</sup>[Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population data for 2011 accessed August 2012 from 'http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/files/SC-EST2011-AGESEX-RES.csv']

The child count data for this indicator were captured via Ohio's electronic data system.

Comparing Ohio to Other States

Ohio ranks 9<sup>th</sup> nationally for this indicator, compared to 6<sup>th</sup> in FFY2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not required in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicators 5 and 6	Timeline	Resources
1. Develop a statewide marketing plan to ensure the public is aware of HMG and how to make a referral into Early Intervention.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Help Me Grow 800-number</li> <li>➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association</li> <li>➤ Ohio AAP</li> <li>➤ BCMH</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>
2. Develop and disseminate information to pediatricians, hospitals, clinics, and family practice physicians and nurse practitioners to	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Help Me Grow 800-number</li> <li>➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association</li> <li>➤ Ohio AAP</li> </ul>

educate about HMG and how to make a referral into Early Intervention.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ BCMH</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>
---	--	---

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	3.0% of infants and toddlers birth to age three years will have IFSPs.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** 3.36 percent of infants and toddlers birth to age three years had IFSPs for FFY 2010. This percentage is calculated by dividing the 0 to 3 child count reported to Westat by the Ohio Department of Health (ODH) on February 1, 2012 of 14,103 and the 2011 population estimate of 419,187.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>[Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2011. Data updated as of July 15, 2012]

<sup>2</sup>[Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population data for 2011 accessed August 2012 from 'http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/files/SC-EST2011-AGESEX-RES.csv']

The child count data for this indicator were captured via Ohio's electronic data system.

Comparing Ohio to Other States

Ohio ranks 18<sup>th</sup> nationally for this indicator, compared to 16<sup>th</sup> in FFY 2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not required in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicators 5 and 6	Timeline	Resources
1. Develop a statewide marketing plan to ensure the public is aware of HMG and how to make a referral into	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Help Me Grow 800-number</li> <li>➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association</li> <li>➤ Ohio AAP</li> </ul>

Early Intervention.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ BCMH</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>
2. Develop and disseminate information to pediatricians, hospitals, clinics, and family practice physicians and nurse practitioners to educate about HMG and how to make a referral into Early Intervention.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Help Me Grow 800-number</li> <li>➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association</li> <li>➤ Ohio AAP</li> <li>➤ BCMH</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 7:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C’s 45-day timeline.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Twenty-nine EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2011. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children served by these EIS programs who also had a 45-day timeline that ended during the April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 timeframe were included in the analysis. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. Of the 1,098 child records examined, 1,088 (99.1 percent) were compliant. A total of six findings were issued to six EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY12, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY13 APR.

The 1098 child records counted as being compliant includes 235 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 235 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

The 10 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 7 (70 percent) for staff oversight/error
- 2 (20 percent) for staff scheduling/availability
- 1 (10 percent) for insufficient evaluation slots

**45 Day Findings Issued During FFY11**

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2010	4
FFY 2011	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Although it's less than the target of 100%, 99.1 percent demonstrates progress from the 98.7 percent compliance reported for FFY 2010. Seven findings of noncompliance were due for correction in FFY11, 6 of which were corrected timely and the last one has since been corrected, all verified by ODH consistent with OSEP Memo 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.

-The ODH continues to work on improving the results for this indicator with monthly technical assistance calls with EIS providers and compliance-related trainings, site-visits to providers, and the creation and dissemination of guidance documents.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 7	Timeline	Resources
1. Continue to monitor this indicator via ODH's web-based data system, Early Track, and on site focused monitoring visits.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH data and monitoring teams</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> <li>➤ Local partners</li> </ul>
2. ODH will provide technical assistance to counties who are identified with noncompliance in this area.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH technical assistance team</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> </ul>
3. Examine barriers identified by counties in not meeting developmental evaluations and/or not completing IFSPs within 45 days.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SICC</li> <li>➤ ODH data, monitoring, and technical assistance teams</li> </ul>
4. Engage stakeholders to review the Evaluation & Assessment and IFSP processes in the state.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Stakeholders</li> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8:** Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C who received timely transition planning support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 100% of children exiting Part C have an IFSP with transition steps and services</li> <li>B. 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B in which notification to the LEA occurred</li> <li>C. 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B in which the transition conference occurred</li> </ul>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:**

8A. Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2011. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its compliance percentage for this indicator. All children served by these scheduled EIS programs with a Transition Planning Conference due to occur no later than a date between October 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011 were included in the analysis for this indicator. The ODH specified the children and local EIS providers

reported whether or not the child specified had transition steps and services on the child’s IFSP. Of 289 records examined, 287 included transition steps and services on the IFSP (99.3 percent). A total of one finding was issued to one EIS program; this finding was issued in FFY11, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY12 APR.

A. IFSPs with transition steps and services	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Children exiting Part C whom have an IFSP with transition steps and services	287	99.3
b. Children exiting Part C whom do not have an IFSP with transition steps and services	2	0.7
TOTAL	289	100

Both noncompliant cases were per local programs’ self-report.

**8A - Steps Findings Issued During FFY11**

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2010	1
FFY 2011	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>

8B. Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from local Help Me Grow EI programs. Reports are generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2011 and January 31, 2012 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification. For FFY11, 798 families opted out of having their information shared with the LEA; therefore, these records were not included in the analysis for this indicator. When distributing these reports to the LEAs, local Help Me Grow Programs were asked to submit copies of the report to ODH as well. The reports were compiled and local and statewide compliance was calculated. Of 6,190 children who were potentially eligible for Part B services within this timeframe, LEAs were notified of 6,055 (97.8 percent). A total of four findings were issued to four EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY11, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY12 APR.

B. Notification to the LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom notification to the LEA occurred	6,055	97.8
b. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom notification to the LEA did not occur	135	2.2
TOTAL	6,190	100

The 135 noncompliant cases identified were concentrated within four local EI programs, all of which corrected their noncompliance with subsequent submissions of quarterly LEA reports.

**8B - LEA Findings Issued During FFY11**

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2010	4
FFY 2011	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>

8C. Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2011. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children served by the scheduled EIS programs who also had a Transition Planning Conference due to occur during the October 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 timeframe were included in the analysis. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. Of the 589 child records examined, 585 (99.3 percent) were compliant. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY11, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY12 APR.

Of the 585 child records counted as compliant, 58 were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 58 records are included in the numerator and denominator.

C. Transition Planning Conferences	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom a TPC should have occurred	585	99.3
b. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom a TPC occurred no later than 90 days before their 3 <sup>rd</sup> birthday	4	0.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>100</b>

The 4 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 3 (75 percent) for staff oversight/error
- 1 (25percent) for data/documentation errors

**8C - Transition Planning Conference Findings Issued During FFY11**

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2010	8
FFY 2011	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:**

- A. 99.3 percent indicates progress from the 99.2 percent compliance reported for FFY2010, bringing Ohio closer to the target of 100%. Three findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY11, none of which were corrected in a timely manner, but all have since corrected, verified by ODH consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. ODH ensured that the EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-

## APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

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. Ohio revised its IFSP training during the fiscal year and attributes the progress made on Transition Steps to the revised and improved training.

- B. Ohio improved to 97.8%, from 93.1% reported in FFY 2010, also moving closer to the target of 100%. Three findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY11, all of which were corrected timely and verified by ODH consistent with OSEP Memo 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.
- C. Although less than the target of 100%, 99.3 percent indicates improvement from 97.8 percent compliance reported for FFY 2010. Twelve findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY11, all of which were timely corrected and verified by ODH consistent with OSEP Memo 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. The TPC expectations are included in the state's revised IFSP training. This training is mandatory for credential, which is mandatory for service coordinators. The ODH attributes the progress made on this indicator to better training and technical assistance. However, we believe we are not yet at 100% because Transition Planning Conferences still need some clarification in the state's rule on IFSPs. The revisions have been made, but still have a six month process to be implemented.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 8	Timeline	Resources
1. Provide information, including materials, for families that support transition activities.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> <li>➤ ODE</li> <li>➤ SICC</li> </ul>
2. Monitor this indicator via ODH's web-based data system, Early Track, and on site focused monitoring visits.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH data and monitoring teams</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> </ul>
3. ODH will provide technical assistance to counties who are identified with noncompliance in this area.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH Technical Assistance staff</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> </ul>
4. Monitor progress on implementation of the student identifier (SSID) between ODH & ODE.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> <li>➤ ODE</li> </ul>
5. Update the <i>Transition—What is It?</i> Brochure for parents.	FFY 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 9:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the “Indicator 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>100% of identified findings of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** 90.2 percent of findings of noncompliance issued during FFY 2010 were corrected within one year, or 46 of 51 total issued findings of noncompliance.

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than 1 year from identification
1. % of infants & toddlers with IFSPs who receive EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	6	6	5

# APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than 1 year from identification
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
2. % of infants & toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	0	0	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
3. % of infants & toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	0	0	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	0	0	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of infants & toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs 6. Percent of infants & toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	0	0	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
7. Percent of eligible infants & toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation & assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within part C's 45 day timeline	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	7	7	6
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

OHIO  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than 1 year from identification
8. percent of children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool & other appropriate community services by their 3 <sup>rd</sup> birthday including  A. IFSPs with transition steps & services	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	3	3	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
8. percent of children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool & other appropriate community services by their 3 <sup>rd</sup> birthday including  B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	3	3	3
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
8. percent of children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	12	12	12

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

OHIO  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11)	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than 1 year from identification
child’s transition to preschool & other appropriate community services by their 3 <sup>rd</sup> birthday including  C. Transition Conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B infants & toddlers with IFSPs who receive EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	0	0	0
Others areas of Noncompliance	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	0	0	0
	Dispute resolution: complaints, hearings	20	20	20

**Additional Notes**

- **Indicator 1:** The 6 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY11 were reported in the FFY09 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 7:** The 7 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY11 were reported in the FFY09 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 8A:** The 3 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY11 were reported in the FFY09 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 8B:** The 3 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY11 were reported in the FFY09 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 8C:** The 12 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY11 were reported in the FFY09 APR for this indicator

**Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the	<b>51</b>
--	-----------

## APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>46</b>
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>5</b>

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>5</b>
5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	<b>5</b>
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:** 90.2% indicates improvement from 77.3% reported in FFY 2010, still missing the target of 100%. For most methods of monitoring local programs’ compliance and performance, data from EIS programs are analyzed from a web-based data system; with additional data coming from self-assessment, focused monitoring and dispute resolution.

- In FFY 2010, ODH issued 51 findings, 46 of which were corrected in a timely manner. Of the 5 programs who did not correct in a timely manner, all 5 have since corrected. In addition, the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were reported as not being corrected in Ohio’s FFY 2010 APR have since corrected. For all findings determined to have been corrected, the ODH verifies that each program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements for the particular indicator as a result of completing the required actions placed upon them. Verification processes are associated with more recent data indicating compliance and the correction of each individual case of noncompliance from the original finding FFY for children who still are enrolled with the corresponding EIS program, or the completion of any/all required actions, albeit late, for each individual case of noncompliance from the original finding FFY for children who still are enrolled with the corresponding EIS program. EIS programs with findings not corrected in a timely manner will be monitored in a manner consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, including verification of correction.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 9	Timeline	Resources
1. Review complaint information (e.g., mediations, due process hearing, investigations) to determine areas of non-compliance and identify trends & needs.	Ongoing	➤ ODH staff
2. Review and monitor county corrective action plans to assure correction of noncompliance areas within one year of identification of complaints.	Within one year of complaint	➤ ODH staff

## APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

3. Provide technical assistance or training as needed to assure correction of noncompliance.	As needed outlined in corrective action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> </ul>
4. Notify Director of Health of continued noncompliance, in order to impose sanctions as appropriate.	As needed for any complaints with identified noncompliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Ohio met the target for this indicator, as 100 percent of signed written complaints (n = 2) were issued reports resolved within the 60-day timeline.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not required, in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 10	Timeline	Resources
1. Monitor complaint resolution as outlined in internal procedure.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ODH staff</li> <li>➤ State partners</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** Updated the improvement activities, based on stakeholder input.

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

# APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO  
State

**Indicator 11:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** ODH received no requests for due process hearings during this time period.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not required, in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 11	Timeline	Resources
1. Initiate administrative hearing procedure as outlined in the Procedural Safeguards Policy.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-4)	➤ ODH staff
2. Assign Hearing Officer and conduct administrative hearing at date, time and location based on reasonable convenience of the family.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-4)	
3. Assure that family is notified of their rights in the administrative hearing process. The decision of the hearing officer is binding.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-4)	
4. Monitor for resolution within required timelines.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-4)	

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: No changes made.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 12:** 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)

**Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>Not applicable - Ohio Part C does not use Part B due process procedures.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** Not applicable

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011: Not applicable

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 13:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	<i>92% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:** There were no mediations held in Ohio in FFY 2011.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not applicable.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 13	Timeline	Resources
1. Continue use of protocol for dispute resolution process specific to mediation activities and timelines.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-3).	➤ ODH staff
2. Assign Mediation Officer and conduct mediation at date, time and location based on reasonable convenience of the family.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-3).	➤ ODH staff
3. Assure that mediation process and agreement is kept confidential.	Within 30 days of receipt of request for administrative hearing (for activities 1-3).	➤ ODH staff/family/other participants
4. Monitor for implementation of mediation agreement within required timelines.	Within 60 - 90 days following mediation agreement.	➤ ODH staff/other participants

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** No changes made.

<p><b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision</b></p>
---

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

<p><b>Measurement:</b> State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:</p> <p>a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for</p>
---

exiting and dispute resolution); and  
 b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.  
 States are required to use the “Indicator 14 Data Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100% of State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are: a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 7 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:** 100% percent of state reported data were submitted on time and accurately by Ohio as determined by using the Data Rubric for data applicable to the APR time period (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012), thus meeting the target for this indicator.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:** Not required, in accordance with OSEP Memo 13 – 7, issued December 12, 2012.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 14	Timeline	Resources
1. Continual improvement of the statewide data system (Early Track).	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data team</li> <li>➤ OMIS staff</li> </ul>
2. Continual improvement of the Early Track data reports.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data team</li> <li>➤ OMIS staff</li> <li>➤ EIS providers</li> </ul>
3. Report data to Westat/OSEP by required timelines.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data team</li> <li>➤ Early Track</li> </ul>
4. Conduct trainings for EIS providers who oversee data in Early Track to teach reporting functions which help them self-monitor data entry for accuracy and timeliness.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data team</li> <li>➤ Early Track</li> </ul>
5. Implement various data verification strategies with counties.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data team</li> </ul>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:** No changes made.