



OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

246 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

614/466-3543
www.odh.ohio.gov

John R. Kasich / Governor

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

April 25, 2014

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
Potomac Center Plaza
Mail Stop 2600, Room 4166
550 12th Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Melody Musgrove:

Attached is Ohio's CLARIFIED Annual Performance Report, including the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) Certification form signed by the co-chair of the Council, for the period of Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013).

Both the clarified APR and the un-revised SPP can be accessed on our website at <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/Early%20Intervention/reporting.aspx>

You will find clarifications highlighted in yellow. The text is red underlined when it was added to this clarified version, based on the technical assistance provided by our OSEP state contact. Text is highlighted, but not red underlined when it was in the initially submitted APR and by highlighting, we believed it would help clarify any outstanding questions. Clarifications are provided on the following pages of the APR:

Introduction Page 2
Indicator 1 Pages 3 – 4
Indicator 7 Pages 18 – 19
Indicator 8 Pages 20 – 24

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 614 – 728 – 9152 or via email at wendy.grove@odh.ohio.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wendy Grove".

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

OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012– June 30, 2013)

April 25, 2014
Clarifications Period



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 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. 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.**

To fulfill the public reporting requirement, Ohio's APR was posted on the homepage at <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/default.aspx> under the "HMG News and Notes" section from November 29, 2013 to January 29, 2014. The SICC discussed the drafted document at their quarterly meeting on November 12, 2013. This document is available to the public on the "Federal Reporting" page of the website, located at <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/Early%20Intervention/reporting.aspx>.

The State Performance Plan (SPP) was not revised, and is located at the same web address: <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/Early%20Intervention/reporting.aspx>.

Additionally, the performance of each of Ohio's 88 county Help Me Grow Early Intervention programs in meeting compliance and performance indicators is posted on the website here: <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/Early%20Intervention/countycards/countycards.aspx>.

Monthly calls include information about these performance reports, as well as the Annual Performance Report. Once the calls are complete, handouts and recorded calls are available to the public on the website here: <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/default.aspx> under the "HMG News and Notes" section.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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
2012	<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 2012: 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. 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.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2012. 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 June 1, 2012 to August 31, 2012 timeframe were examined electronically. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. 1242 of the 1250 children examined, or 99.4 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 1242 child records counted as being compliant includes 37 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 37 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

The 8 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 4 (50 percent) provider availability
- 3 (38 percent) for data/documentation errors
- 1 (13 percent) for staff scheduling issues

Timely Receipt of Services Findings Issued During FFY12

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2011	3
FFY 2012	3
Total	6

The findings in the above table were all issued during FFY2012, 3 of which were based on FFY2011 data (reported in the FFY2011 APR), and 3 of which were based on FFY2012 data (discussed above). As they were issued in FFY2012, they will be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY13 APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Though Ohio did not meet its target of 100%, 99.4 percent indicates improvement from the 98.7 percent compliance reported for FFY11. Eight findings for this indicator were due for correction in FFY12, all of which 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. 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 2012: No changes made.

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
2012	<i>84% 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 2012: 80.7 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 and FFY 2011, ODH calculated the settings percentage by examining the services listed on the IFSP and computing total planned time per setting to determine which setting accounted for most total time in service delivery. Using this methodology, ODH determined that 8,936 of the total 11,073 children received early intervention services primarily in the home or in programs for typically developing children.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2012: Ohio did not meet its target for Indicator #2. It is theorized that we are measuring the data for this indicator more accurately, and thus, the data are reflecting more accurate picture of where services are receiving services. Moreover, the provider grant as well as provider agreements now explicitly require services in natural environments; changes which have only been in place for a year in these binding agreements. Improvement activities were updated with notes to reflect the work under way with new ODH-DODD partnership.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 2	Timeline	Improvement Activities for Indicator 2
1. Change Medicaid state plan to help finance early intervention services in natural environments. *This work is under way with an implementation timeline in SFY 2015/FFY 2014	FFY 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODJFS ➤ ODH ➤ Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Education
2. Develop an implementation plan to embed and integrate evidence-based Early Intervention practices into services throughout the statewide system. *This work is under way, with DODD as lead	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH ➤ DODD ➤ DD Council
3. Identify providers of early intervention and related services and utilize them for home and community	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH ➤ DODD

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

<p>services.</p> <p>*This work is under way, with DODD as lead</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ County Boards of DD ➤ Bureau for Children with Medical Handicaps (BCMh) program ➤ ODE ➤ Private providers
<p>4. 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.).</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Preparation grants/Advisory Councils in Ohio ➤ DD Council ➤ DODD

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011: Provided updates to the improvement activities as a result of stakeholder feedback.

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:

- 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	
2012	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
	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	63.1%
	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	63.4%
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
	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	63.0%
	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	63.0%
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	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	63.6%	

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: 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

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

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	311	5.3%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,080	18.5%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	607	10.4%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,283	22.0%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,554	43.8%
Total	N=5,835	100%

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	322	5.5%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,277	21.9%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	710	12.2%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,528	26.2%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,998	34.2%
Total	N=5,835	100%

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	270	4.6%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,124	19.3%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved	690	11.8%

functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach		
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,735	29.7%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,016	34.5%
Total	N=5,835	100%

Summary Statements	Percent of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
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	57.6%
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	65.8%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
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	58.3%
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	60.4%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
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	63.5%
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	64.3%

Measurement strategies to collect data

- 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* and exit during the reporting year are included in the child outcomes analysis. 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.
- The child's IFSP team including the child's family use a variety of data sources to make a determination of the child's performance level. The child's performance is scored using a seven

(7)-point scale included on the adapted COSF originally developed by the Early Childhood Outcome Center.

- Currently, child outcomes data is collected 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. Progress is measured using each child’s Entry COSF and Exit COSF scores.
- ODH uses the recommended OSEP Categories Calculator provided by the Early Childhood Outcome Center to determine progress categories for the COSF.
- 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 2012: Ohio experienced improvement from FFY11 for Summary Statement 1 for all three outcomes, but experienced slippage for all outcomes for Summary Statement 2. 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. The differences in percentages from last year to this year are believed to be, at least in part, due to the implementation of new rules, including changes in eligibility standards. A smaller percentage of children came in at age expectations, thus we would expect that more children would show improvements, but that fewer children would then exit within age expectations.

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"> ➤ ODH staff ➤ Contracted agency staff ➤ SICC
2. Analyze data summaries to look for discrepancies by county, service agency, service coordinator	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH staff ➤ Contracted agency staff
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"> ➤ ODH
4. Access available training from DaSy center to implement in Ohio an updated training for Service Coordinators to complete COSF.	FFY 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DaSy

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Added new #4 as a result of stakeholder feedback.

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)

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	<p>A. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families know their rights.</p> <p>B. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families effectively communicate their children's needs.</p> <p>C. 93% of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped families help their children develop and learn.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: This year, the survey produced the following data:

- A. **Know their rights:** 2,791 of 2,994 (93.2 percent) respondent families reported that Help Me Grow helped them know their rights. Eighteen non-responses were removed from the denominator.
- B. **Communicate their children's needs:** 2,883 of 3,002 (96.0 percent) respondent families reported that Help Me Grow helped them communicate their children's needs. Ten non-responses were removed from the denominator.
- C. **Help their children develop and learn:** 2,857 of 2,999 (95.3 percent) reported that Help Me Grow helped the family help their children develop and learn. Thirteen non-responses were removed from the denominator.

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. Three items 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. 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 to answer HMG Family Outcomes, but some questions were deleted (see attached HMG Family Outcomes Questionnaire).

Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on May 1, 2013 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;
- Mailing the surveys to the Service Coordinator Agencies and having the Service Coordinators deliver them to each family
- In some circumstances, if families were unable to be reached for hand delivery, the option for mailing was made available.
- Encouragement calls were made to families who had not responded to the survey beginning a week after the delivery deadline.
- 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 multiple response options including mailing to ODH, online survey completion, and telephone response.

The ODH mailed out the reminder postcards on August 26, 2013 to let families know the survey would be arriving soon. The surveys were mailed to the service coordination contract managers in each county on September 23, 2013 and Service Coordinators were instructed to deliver the questionnaires to families by October 28, 2013. Encouragement calls began on November 4, 2013. No more responses were accepted after December 2, 2013.

Questionnaire Response

Of 10,492 families who were identified as being served on May 1, 2013, a total of 7,340 received questionnaires. The Ohio Department of Health received 3,012 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 41.0 percent. All of Ohio’s 88 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	N	%
Inbound Calls	14	0.5%
Outbound Calls	1	0%
Mailed (Written Questionnaire)	2,874	95.4%
Internet	123	4.1%
Total	3,012	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:

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents and May 1, 2013 Child Count

Race/Ethnicity	Questionnaire Respondents		May 1, 2013 Child Count	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Hispanic/Latino	99	3.3%	443	4.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	0.1%	27	0.3%
Asian	46	1.5%	152	1.4%
Black or African American	260	8.6%	1,566	14.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0%	15	0.1%
White	2,474	82.1%	7,809	74.4%
Two or More Races	128	4.2%	480	4.6%
Total	3012	100%	10,492	100%

Table 3: Child Age Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents and May 1, 2013 Child Count

Age Range	Questionnaire Respondents		May 1, 2013 Child Count	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-1	146	4.8%	1,541	14.7%
1-2	799	26.5%	3,420	32.6%
2-3	2,067	68.6%	5,531	52.7%
Total	3,012	100%	10,492	100%

In terms of race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the comparison group, which was all children who were being served on May 1, 2013, with White families slightly overrepresented and Black or African American families slightly underrepresented. Respondents were older overall, which is expected, as the age categories for the May 1, 2013 count were based upon the child’s age on the date of the count, and the age categories for respondents were based upon their age on the date of questionnaire distribution (September 23, 2013), thus the same children were several months older at questionnaire distribution.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

- A. 93.2% demonstrates progress from the 86.3% reported for FFY2011
- B. 96.0% demonstrates progress from 91.9% percent reported for FFY2011
- C. 95.3% indicates progress from 90.7% reported in FFY 2011

Ohio met the target of 93% for all of the outcomes and the questionnaire response rate increased from FFY2011, from 27.0% to 41.0%. We made significant changes to the methodology of data collection for these indicators. Primarily, service coordinators hand-delivered the surveys instead of the Lead Agency mailing them directly to families. Moreover, we significantly shortened the survey from eight pages to ten questions on one page; from a 7 point to a 5 point Likert scale. We retained the multiple data collection options, including paper, phone, and internet submission; and we kept the length of time the same for responding and inclusion in the analysis.

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 which is aligned with state (Early Childhood Ohio) and national (DaSy) leadership.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH ➤ Family Information Network ➤ Red Treehouse (Ohio FCFC initiative) ➤ DaSy ➤ Early Childhood Ohio ➤ Early Childhood Advisory Council
2. Review survey data annually & process for distribution to determine areas for continuous improvement.	Annually & ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HMG Evaluation committee ➤ ODH staff
3. Create and maintain social media information pages *This was launched in SFY2013/FFY 2012 and continues	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH ➤ DODD
4. Examine 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 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH ➤ SICC

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Removed last year’s Activity #3 because it was completed. Access the newly updated Parent’s Rights brochure here: <http://www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov/~media/HelpMeGrow/ASSETS/Files/Professionals%20Gallery/Publications/Parents%20rights%20EI.ashx>. Added a new improvement activity (#3) with stakeholder input; and updated Activity #4 to reflect a revised timeline.

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
2012	<i>1.6% of infants and toddlers birth to age one year will have IFSPs.</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: 1.2 percent of infants and toddlers birth to age one year had IFSPs for FFY2012. This percentage is calculated by dividing the December 1, 2012 0 to 1 child count reported to Westat by the Ohio Department of Health (ODH) on February 1, 2013 of 1,600¹ and the 2012 population estimate of 134,419.

¹[Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2012. Data updated as of November 14, 2013.]

²[Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population data for 2012 accessed August 2013 from 'http://www.census.gov/popest/data/state/asrh/2012/SC-EST2012-ALLDATA6.html']

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

Comparing Ohio to Other States

Ohio ranks 21st nationally for this indicator, compared to 9th in FFY2011.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Ohio has seen slippage in our performance of this indicator. In SFY 2013 (FFY 2012), Ohio changed its eligibility criteria for the physical or mental conditions list, reducing it from 435 to 43 conditions and expects that this change, along with guidance to exit children no longer being served. These changes have resulted in a reduced overall number, but also in an increase in the number of children with significant delays and disabilities being served in Early Intervention.

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. *This is underway, with materials to launch within SFY2014/FFY2013	FFY 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Help Me Grow 800-number ➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association ➤ Ohio AAP ➤ BCMH ➤ ODH ➤ DODD

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

<p>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 and receive information through feedback loop as requested.</p> <p>*This is underway, with materials to launch within SFY2014/FFY2013</p>	<p>FFY 2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Help Me Grow 800-number ➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association ➤ Ohio AAP ➤ BCMH ➤ ODH ➤ DODD
--	-----------------	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Updated the improvement activities to reflect the work underway.

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
2012	3.1% of infants and toddlers birth to age three years will have IFSPs.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: 2.7 percent of infants and toddlers birth to age three years had IFSPs for FFY 2012. 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, 2013 of 11,073 and the 2012 population estimate of 409,393.²

¹[Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2012. Data updated as of November 14, 2013.]

²[Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population data for 2012 accessed August 2013 from 'http://www.census.gov/popest/data/state/asrh/2012/SC-EST2012-ALLDATA6.html']

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

Comparing Ohio to Other States

Ohio ranks 28th nationally for this indicator, compared to 18th in FFY 2011.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Ohio has seen slippage in our performance of this indicator. In SFY 2013 (FFY 2012), Ohio changed its eligibility criteria for the physical or mental conditions list, reducing it from 435 to 43 conditions and expects that this change, along with guidance to exit children no longer being served. These changes have resulted in a reduced overall number, but also in an increase in the number of children with significant delays and disabilities being served in Early Intervention.

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. *This is underway, with materials to launch within SFY2014/FFY2013	FFY 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Help Me Grow 800-number ➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association ➤ Ohio AAP ➤ BCMH ➤ ODH ➤ DODD
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 and receive information through feedback loop as requested. *This is underway, with materials to launch within SFY2014/FFY2013	FFY 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Help Me Grow 800-number ➤ ODE, Ohio Head Start Association ➤ Ohio AAP ➤ BCMH ➤ ODH ➤ DODD

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Updated the improvement activities and timelines to reflect the work underway.

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
2012	<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 2012: 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. 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.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2012. 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 October 18, 2012 to December 31, 2012 timeframe were included in the analysis. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. Of the 598 child records examined, 569 (95.2 percent) were compliant. A total of 9 findings were issued to 9 EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY13, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY14 APR.

The 569 child records counted as being compliant includes 165 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 165 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

The 29 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 10 (34 percent) for lack of documentation
- 7 (24 percent) for staff oversight/error
- 7 (24 percent) for staff scheduling/availability
- 5 (17 percent) for insufficient evaluation slots

45 Day Findings Issued During FFY12

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2011	7
FFY 2012	0
Total	7

The findings in the above table were all issued during FFY2012, but based on FFY2011 data (and reported in the FFY2011 APR). As they were issued in FFY2012, they will be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY13 APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: 95.2% indicates slippage from 99.1 percent reported for FFY11, slippage we

theorize is due to inclusion of more components of the 45 Day timeline than we have previously in the monitoring of this indicator. **Four findings of noncompliance were due for correction in FFY12, 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.

Additionally, in Indicator 7 of the FFY10 APR, ODH reported that 6 of the 8 findings reported for FFY2009 were corrected. The two findings not corrected timely have since been 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 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"> ➤ ODH data and monitoring teams ➤ State partners ➤ Local partners
2. ODH will provide technical assistance to counties who are identified with noncompliance in this area.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH technical assistance team ➤ DODD ➤ OFCFC
3. Examine barriers identified across the state as to why developmental evaluations and/or IFSPs are not being completed within 45 days of program referral.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH data, monitoring, and technical assistance teams ➤ DODD ➤ OFCFC
4. Engage stakeholders to review the Evaluation & Assessment and IFSP processes in the state. *This work started in SFY2014/FFY 2013 and is currently ongoing	FFY 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Stakeholders ➤ ODH ➤ DODD

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Clarified language in Improvement Activity #3 and updated the timeline for Improvement Activity #4 and, based on stakeholder input and work under way.

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:

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.

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) 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 the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays. 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 2012	A. 100% of children exiting Part C have an IFSP with transition steps and services B. 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B in which

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>notification to the LEA occurred</i></p> <p>C. 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B in which the transition conference occurred</p>
--	--

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

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. 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.

8A. Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2012. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its compliance percentage for this indicator. A selection of children served by each of these scheduled EIS programs with a Transition Planning Conference due to occur no later than a date between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013 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. All of the 271 records examined included transition steps and services on the IFSP at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child's third birthday (100 percent), therefore no findings were issued for this indicator.

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	271	100
b. Children exiting Part C whom do not have an IFSP with transition steps and services	0	0
TOTAL	271	100

Steps Findings Issued During FFY12

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2011	0
FFY 2012	0
Total	0

As indicated in the above table, there were no findings issued during FFY2012 based on FFY2011 or FFY2012 data. This will be reflected in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY2013 APR.

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, 2012 and January 31, 2013 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification. For FFY12, 544 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. LEAs were notified of all 5,096 children who were potentially eligible for Part B services within this timeframe (100 percent). 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 use 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.

The measurement for this indicator did not reflect all of the requirements, as ODH ensured the LEAs were informed of all children turning three. While ODH also communicates children transitioning quarterly with the SEA, we do not have a process which ensures that every child is made known to the SEA at least 90 calendar days before each child’s third birthday. Additionally, the notification to the LEA did not always occur at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. ODH will enact a process of corrected data extraction immediately which will ensure that the quarterly communication between Lead Agency (ODH) and the SEA will be for children at least 90 days before each child’s third birthday, and will also edit LEA reports to ensure that the LEAs are informed of children turning three at least 90 days prior to their third birthday.

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	5,096	100%
b. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom notification to the LEA did not occur	0	0%
TOTAL	5,096	100%

8B - LEA Findings Issued During FFY12

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2011	0
FFY 2012	0
Total	0

As indicated in the above table, there were no findings issued during FFY2012 based on FFY2011 or FFY2012 data. This will be reflected in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY2013 APR.

8C. Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2012. 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 January 1, 2013 through March 31, 2013 timeframe were included in the analysis. A selection of child records was then verified to ensure accurate reporting. Of the 523 child records examined, 518 (99.0 percent) were compliant in that there was a Transition Planning Conference at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child’s third birthday, or the record had a documented

extraordinary family circumstance to explain the missed timeline. A total of two findings were issued to two EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY13, and will therefore be included in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY14 APR.

Of the 523 child records counted as compliant, 74 were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 74 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	518	99.0%
b. Children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B for whom a TPC occurred no later than 90 days before their 3 rd birthday	5	0%
TOTAL	523	100%

The 5 noncompliant child records are deemed as such for the following reasons:

- 3 (60 percent) for data/documentation errors
- 2 (40 percent) for LEA schedule problems

8C - Transition Planning Conference Findings Issued During FFY12

Actual Target Data for:	Number of Findings Issued
FFY 2011	0
FFY 2012	0
Total	0

As indicated in the above table, there were no findings issued during FFY2012 based on FFY2011 or FFY2012 data. This will be reflected in the report of Indicator 9 for the FFY2013 APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

A. Ohio met its target of 100%, improving from the 99.3 percent compliance reported for FFY2010. Two findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY12, both of which were corrected in a timely manner and 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-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 has now fully implemented its revised IFSP training, adding in-person application training to the required on-line course and attributes the progress made on Transition Steps to the revised and improved training.

B. Ohio improved to 100%, from 97.8% reported in FFY 2011, thus meeting the target. Four findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY12, 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. 99.0 percent indicates slight slippage from 99.3 percent compliance reported for FFY 2011. Ten findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY12, 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. Additionally, in Indicator 8C of the FFY10 APR, ODH reported that 15 of the 20 findings reported for FFY2009 were corrected. The five findings not corrected timely have since been 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.

B.D. _____

~~C.E. 99.0 percent indicates slight slippage from 99.3 percent compliance reported for FFY 2011. Ten findings of noncompliance for this indicator were due for correction in FFY12, 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"> ➤ ODH staff ➤ ODE ➤ SICC
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"> ➤ ODH data and monitoring teams ➤ State partners
3. ODH will provide technical	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH Technical Assistance staff

assistance to counties who are identified with noncompliance in this area.		➤ State partners
4. Monitor progress on implementation of the student identifier (SSID) between ODH & ODE.	Ongoing	➤ ODH ➤ ODE

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Removed previous improvement activity #5 because it is no longer a priority given the State Education Agency has published transition materials for use in Early Intervention.

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
2012	<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 2012: 100 percent of findings of noncompliance issued during FFY 2011 were corrected within one year, or 58 of 58 total issued findings of noncompliance.

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	# 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	8	8	8
	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	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	4	4	4

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than 1 year from identification
initial IFSP meeting were conducted within part C's 45 day timeline	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 rd birthday including A. IFSPs with transition steps & services	Monitoring activities: self-assessment/Local APR, data review, desk audit, on site visits or other	2	2	2
	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 rd 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	4	4	4
	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	10	10	10

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components.	# of EIS programs issued findings in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	(a) # of EIS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2011 (7/1/11 – 6/30/12)	# 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 rd 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	1	10	10

Additional Notes

- **Indicator 1:** The 8 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY12 were reported in the FFY10 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 7:** The 4 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY12 were reported in the FFY10 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 8A:** One of the two findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY12 was reported in the FFY10 APR for this indicator and the other was reported in the FFY11 APR for this indicator.
- **Indicator 8B:** The 4 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY12 were reported in the FFY11 APR for this indicator
- **Indicator 8C:** Of the 10 findings of noncompliance due for correction in FFY12, 8 were reported in the FFY10 APR for this indicator and 2 were reported in the FFY11 APR for this indicator.

APR Template – Part C (4)

OHIO
State

Correction of FFY 2011 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 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	38
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)	38
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 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)	0
5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: 100% indicates progress from 90.2% reported in FFY 2011. 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 2011, ODH issued 38 findings, all of which were corrected in a timely manner. For all findings determined to have been corrected, the ODH verified 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.

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
3. Provide technical assistance or training as needed to assure correction of noncompliance.	As needed	➤ ODH staff ➤ State partners
4. Notify Director of Health of continued noncompliance, in order to impose sanctions as appropriate.	As needed	➤ ODH staff

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: No changes.

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
2012	<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 2012: 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 2012: Ohio maintained performance on this indicator at 100%.

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

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: No changes made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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
2012	<i>100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: ODH received one request for due process hearing during this time period and one of one (100%) of the requests were full adjudicated within the acceptable timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Ohio maintained performance on this indicator at 100%.

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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH staff ➤ DODD ➤ State partners ➤ Local partners ➤ Service providers
2. Assign Hearing Officer and conduct administrative hearing at date, time and location based on reasonable convenience of the family.		
3. Assure that family is notified of their rights in the administrative hearing process. The decision of the hearing officer is binding.		
4. Monitor for resolution within required timelines.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Updated the resources available to reflect lessons learned in progressing through the first administrative hearing conducted in Ohio in FFY 2012.

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
2012	<i>100% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: Not applicable, as zero hearing requests went to resolution sessions.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 12	Timeline	Resources
1. Monitor hearing requests for resolution session as outlined in internal procedure.	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ODH staff ➤ State partners

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Added one Improvement Activity, as Ohio adopted Part B resolution procedures when it changed its program rules in FFY 2012.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011: Not applicable, as this is the first year this indicator has been applicable to Ohio.

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
-----	--------------------------------

2012	92% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
------	---

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: There was one mediation held in Ohio in FFY 2012 and that mediation did not result in a mediation agreement, but went on to administrative hearing.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Improvement activities have worked well for the performance of this indicator. Slippage in percentage is certain when the state only had one experience measured under this performance indicator and that mediation failed to end in agreement.

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.		➤ ODH staff
3. Assure that mediation process and agreement is kept confidential.		➤ ODH staff/family/other participants
4. Monitor for implementation of mediation agreement within required timelines.	Within 60 - 90 days following any mediation agreement.	➤ ODH staff/other participants

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 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>Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement. <p>States are required to use the “Indicator 14 Data Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).</p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
------------	---------------------------------------

2012	<p>100% of 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, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 7 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and</p> <p>b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).</p>
------	---

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012: 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, 2012 – June 30, 2013), thus meeting the target for this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012: Ohio maintained 100% compliance.

Improvement Activities for Indicator 14	Timeline	Resources
1. Continual improvement of the statewide data system (Early Track).	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data team ➤ OMIS staff
2. Report data to Westat/OSEP by required timelines.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data team ➤ Early Track
3. 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.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data team ➤ Early Track
4. Implement various data verification strategies with counties.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data team

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012: Eliminated previous Improvement Activity #2, with stakeholder input.

**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 3, 2014.

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

1. [] Submitting its own annual report for FFY 2012 (which is attached); or
2. [X] Using the State's Part C APR for FFY 2012 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.

Kimberly L. Travers
Signature of ICC Chairperson

11/12/2013
Date

905 Hampton Drive
Macedonia OH 44056

Ktravers@windstream.net

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 3, 2014.



Directions: We want to know how helpful Help Me Grow has been 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 private and at no time will your individual answers be shared with others. 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
-------------------	----------	----------------------------	-------	----------------

	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 the Help Me Grow Program 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
- *Call* Help Me Grow at 1-800-755-GROW (4769), press zero (0) to ask for the survey and give your answers. Use the ID# on the upper right corner of the survey. OR
- *Go online* to <http://hmg.cmrinc.com/hmgfs13> and answer the survey, using the ID at top of this page.