

OHIO's PART C Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2014 (July 1, 2014– June 30, 2015)

Submitted January 29, 2016



Introduction

General Supervision System

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

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

Technical Assistance System:

Both ODH and its EI system partner, the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD) provide technical assistance. Early Intervention program consultants sit at both state agencies and provide timely, high quality technical assistance to all 88 Ohio county-based EI programs. ODH and DODD have divided the technical assistance work by topic. Each local EI program has one ODH and one DODD TA consultant. Consultants from both agencies work in tandem to deliver one message to the field. Both agencies participate in training development and delivery, support of requests from EI programs in the way of on-site program visits, and monitoring and verification of data.

ODH provides the grant money to the local EI programs and thus provides technical assistance around the grant's allowable expenditures, program and expenditure reports, and program integrity and adherence to the program rule (OAC 3701-8). DODD program consultants provide technical assistance that focuses on evaluation and assessment, IFSP outcome development, and service provision. During the most recent reporting period, DODD consultants completed an intensive analysis of all counties' evaluation and assessment processes. After the analysis, each county's TA consultant designed a targeted, specific technical assistance and training plan for the county.

Monthly calls were conducted with the field of Early Intervention to provide information, guidance, and answers to questions asked by participants. These calls were recorded and accompanied by a handout with the information discussed. Call handouts and recordings are available via our program website located at www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov. In addition to the monthly calls, Early Intervention staff also prepare and conduct topic-specific webinars and conference calls, as needed.

In June 2015, ODH began a new form of communication with the field to provide important updates around program requirements, due dates, and training opportunities. ODH sends this electronic communication every other Friday to all EI service coordination contract managers. DODD partners send the communication to their network of county boards at the same time. This new communication format gives EI program leadership at ODH and DODD the opportunity to provide regular program updates about a variety of topics. Recipients of the communication were surveyed in August 2015 and they were very enthusiastic about it.

Professional Development System:

During the most recent reporting period, Ohio has made significant strides forward in the area of professional development. Ohio carried out an in-depth look at each county's EI program with a focus on the evaluation and assessment process. Using data collected in this process, Ohio determined that there was a need for a number of new trainings. Ohio created trainings in the areas of evaluation and assessment, child outcomes, functional outcomes, and the IFSP form.

Not only did Ohio create many new trainings, but it diversified the training format. Our new trainings run the gamut of in-person trainings, instructor-led webinars, and user-directed webinars. After state staff performed in-person versions of each training, a decision was made about the best format for the training. Since in-person trainings present fiscal and geographic barriers for both attendees and instructors, we have put a focus on using technology to meet training needs through a more accessible means.

We also contracted for creation of an on-line user-directed training module on federal regulations and state rules governing early intervention in Ohio. This module was recently released to the field. In the coming year, the contractor will also create additional training modules around coaching and natural learning environments.

Finally, these trainings were not created in a vacuum. We sought stakeholder input throughout development. This involvement was not limited to discussions with our State Inter-Agency Coordinating Council (SICC). We frequently piloted trainings with local stakeholders prior to broader release to the field. We also ensured trainees' feedback was incorporated into updated versions of the trainings.

Stakeholder Involvement:

Stakeholders in Ohio are engaged in numerous ways, including monthly calls, public postings inviting input and feedback, and quarterly State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meetings and calls. Every month, ODH creates a handout and conducts a call, with an opportunity to ask questions. There are typically 75-125 participants on these calls. For those who cannot listen live, the call is recorded and placed on the homepage of the program website (www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov). The calls announce opportunities for public comment on the APR, annual application for Part C IDEA funds, and any rule or form changes. The public is invited to provide comment for a minimum of thirty calendar days for any document submitted to the USDOE/OSEP. All documents are posted on the program website for a minimum of sixty calendar days.

EI program leadership from both ODH and DODD meets frequently with EI stakeholder organizations and committees. EI program leadership has attended regularly scheduled meetings of stakeholder groups related to county boards of developmental disabilities, the infant hearing program, and Family and Children First Council which is responsible for overseeing the work of service coordination at the local level in Ohio. At these meetings, EI program leadership provides updates relevant to the stakeholder group being addressed and seeks stakeholder input about the EI program.

Announcements go out widely via our email blasts, web page, and social media accounts to EI providers, parents, stakeholders, grantees, service providers, county boards of developmental disabilities, and Regional Infant Hearing Program providers. In addition to these electronic communication strategies, ODH and partners at DODD engage numerous workgroups, including the SICC and a larger, more diverse EI Stakeholder group in quarterly calls and quarterly in-person meetings to discuss any business in Early Intervention that needs input, feedback, advisement, or assistance.

At the November 12, 2015 meeting, this APR was discussed with both the SICC and EI stakeholder group. As we had a number of new members at this meeting, we had a robust discussion and answered many questions. There were no changes made to the targets in the SPP.

Reporting to the Public:

The public is provided each EIS program's performance on the APR indicators, as well as each program's determination category and a description of the method used to make determinations by posting the 88 EI program reports on the program website (www.helpmegrow.ohio.gov) by June 1 of each calendar year. The FFY13 reports were added by June 2015. In addition to posting the FFY13 reports on our public website, ODH also sent an electronic copy of the reports to all local EIS programs. The FFY14 reports will be added to the website by June 2016.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			72.37%	96.80%	98.78%	94.06%	98.59%	98.71%	99.36%	96.11%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data
1,025	1,041	98.46%

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2014. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY14 TRS analysis. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. The 1,025 child records counted as being compliant include 125 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 125 child records are included in the numerator and denominator. A total of five findings were issued to five EIS programs, which were issued during FFY15.

There were no TRS findings due for correction in FFY14.

Ohio reported eight findings in its FFY13 APR; however, these findings were not issued until FFY14, so they are due for correction in FFY15 and the status of their correction will be reported in Ohio's FFY15 APR.

State database

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

All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had services due to start between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY14 TRS analysis.

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

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

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	81.00%
Data		83.91%	86.47%	88.32%	90.24%	91.06%	83.33%	83.93%	80.70%	80.04%

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data
8,764	10,157	86.29%

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	FFY	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.10%	58.00%
	Data	63.02%	60.44%	59.07%	55.33%	57.60%	58.06%
A2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.70%	63.40%	66.00%
	Data	63.34%	62.10%	66.81%	66.65%	65.76%	62.57%
B1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	58.00%
	Data	62.85%	62.41%	59.27%	56.81%	58.33%	59.58%
B2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	60.00%
	Data	62.93%	62.10%	66.89%	61.20%	60.43%	57.60%
C1	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	61.30%	62.60%	64.00%
	Data	62.50%	60.98%	59.21%	62.58%	63.50%	63.48%
C2	Target ≥		60.00%	60.00%	62.00%	63.60%	64.00%
	Data	63.49%	61.85%	67.57%	64.88%	64.28%	60.95%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1,863
---	-------

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	79	4.24%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	341	18.30%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	220	11.81%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	502	26.95%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	721	38.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	722	1,142	63.22%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,223	1,863	65.65%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	82	4.40%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	405	21.74%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	259	13.90%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	541	29.04%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	576	30.92%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	800	1,287	62.16%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,117	1,863	59.96%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	65	3.49%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	379	20.34%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	232	12.45%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	604	32.42%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	583	31.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	836	1,280	65.31%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,187	1,863	63.71%

Comments

Data quality note: Ohio changed its manner for collecting Child Outcomes data January 15th, 2015. Prior to that date, the Child Outcomes Summary Form was used to collect child outcomes data. Beginning in January 2015, the Child Outcomes Summary process was integrated into the child and family assessment process. At that time, Ohio's data system, Early Track, was updated, as well, to collect only Child Outcomes Summary statements (adopted from Maryland) for each of the three outcome areas. Progress data has not been collected since that time, but the data system will be updated to do so with the next update which will occur February 2016.

Because the new method for collecting child outcomes data was implemented in the middle of the fiscal year, all children who were served in Early Intervention for at least six months and exited between January 15th, 2015 and June 30th, 2015 had their entry and exit child outcomes ratings completed using different methods/tools. Since ratings could differ depending which method/tool was used, and because no progress data was collected for any child who exited on or after January 15th, 2015, Ohio has chosen to report on only those children who exited between July 1, 2014 and January 14th, 2015 who had entry and exit child outcomes scores completed using the COSF. As reported above, 1,863 children met those criteria, of 5,536 total children who exited during the time period.

In total, 4,117 children exited between July 1st, 2014 and June 30th, 2015 who were served in Early Intervention for at least six months and had child outcomes summary ratings completed at entry to and exit from the program, so there were an additional 2,254 children who exited between January 15th, 2015 and June 30th 2015, had entry and exit child outcomes scores, and were served in EI at least 6 months, but were not included in reporting. Going forward, the new method for collecting child outcomes data, along with increased guidance and trainings regarding child outcomes, is expected to improve the overall data quality and increase the total number of children for which data can be reported.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	2,336
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,155
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,314
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,204
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,323
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,203
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,327

FFY 2014 Data	
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	93.13% (2,155/2,314)
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	94.88% (2,204/2,323)
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	94.67% (2,203/2,327)

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

Tool Used to Gather Family Outcomes Data

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

1. Help Me Grow 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 on one page.
- The verbiage of the survey was changed to be at a 5th grade reading level.
- The adapted OSEP items (Help Me Grow has helped me know my rights; Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child’s needs; and Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow) were the first questions on the questionnaire rather than dispersed throughout the survey as they are on the latest OSEP version of the questionnaire.
- ODH used most of the other questions on the questionnaire, but some were deleted (see attached HMG Family Outcomes Questionnaire).

Administration of the Questionnaire

Families being served in Early Intervention on May 1, 2015 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:

- ODH sent out postcards prior to administering the survey to remind families the questionnaire would be coming soon.
- As was done last year, the sample of families surveyed was increased by utilizing a date for sampling close to the survey distribution, 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 on Ohio’s Part C program’s data system.
- Families were provided the option to respond to the questionnaire via mailing to ODH or by completing online.
- ODH mailed out the reminder postcards on July 27th, 2015 to let families know the survey would be arriving soon. The surveys were mailed to families the week of September 7th, 2015.

Questionnaire Response

Of 9,788 families who were identified as having children being served on May 1, 2015, a total of 9,337 received questionnaires (with those not receiving questionnaires being due to a deceased child or not having up-to-date address information for the family in the data system). The Ohio Department of Health received 2,336 completed questionnaires, which is a response rate of 25.02%. Eighty-seven of Ohio’s eighty-eight counties were represented in the responses to the Family Questionnaire. The following table outlines the methods families used to respond to the questionnaire:

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaire Respondents’ Response Type

Response Method	Number	Percent
Mail	2,193	93.88%
Web	143	6.12%
Total	2,336	100%

Respondent Representativeness

The following tables provide a comparison of the race/ethnicity and age categories between the respondents and non-respondents of the questionnaire.

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Comparison

Race/Ethnicity	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	0.49%	4	0.17%	38	0.41%
Asian	131	1.87%	36	1.54%	167	1.79%
Black	1,159	16.55%	174	7.45%	1,333	14.28%
Hispanic	302	4.31%	70	3.00%	372	3.98%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	13	0.19%	4	0.17%	17	0.18%
Two or More Races	357	5.10%	88	3.77%	445	4.77%
White	5,005	71.49%	1,960	83.90%	6,965	74.60%
Total	7,001	100.00%	2,336	100.00%	9,337	100.00%

Table 3: Child Age on May 1st, 2015 Comparison

Age Category	Non-Respondents		Respondents		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 to 1	948	13.54%	327	14.00%	1,275	13.66%
1 to 2	2,213	31.61%	725	31.04%	2,938	31.47%
2 to 3	3,840	54.85%	1,284	54.97%	5,124	54.88%
Total	7,001	100.00%	2,336	100.00%	9,337	100.00%

In regard to race/ethnicity, the questionnaire respondents were similar to the overall group, with White families slightly overrepresented and Black or African American families, Hispanic families, and families with a child identified as being of two or more races somewhat underrepresented. Age categories of respondents were comparable to those of all children served on May 1st, 2015.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%	1.60%	1.20%
Data		1.38%	1.43%	1.66%	1.8%	1.75%	1.86%	1.76%	1.19%	1.03%

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.20%	1.30%	1.30%	1.40%	1.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data
1,389	137,250	1.01%

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			2.40%	2.60%	2.80%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	3.10%	2.70%
Data		2.50%	2.64%	2.97%	3.29%	3.21%	3.49%	3.36%	2.70%	2.49%

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.70%	2.80%	2.80%	2.90%	2.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data
10,157	412,890	2.46%

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		N/A	73.80%	94.42%	93.79%	97.52%	98.67%	99.09%	95.15%	95.96%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data
1,005	1,027	97.86%

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period.

Twenty-eight EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2014. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had 45 Day timelines ending between July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014 were included in Ohio's FFY14 45 Day analysis. Of the 1,027 child records examined, 1,005 (98.09 percent) were compliant. A total of four findings were issued to four EIS programs; these findings were issued in FFY14.

The 1,005 child records counted as being compliant include 301 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 301 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

Nine 45 Day findings were due for correction in FFY14, all which were based on FFY12 data and reported in the FFY12 APR, but issued in FFY13. Eight of the nine findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The additional finding has since been corrected. ODH ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

There were an additional six findings reported in the FFY13 APR. However, these findings were issued in FFY14 and therefore due for correction in FFY15, so the status of their correction will be reported in the FFY15 APR.

State database

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

All children among the 28 selected EIS programs who had 45 Day timelines ending between July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014 were included in Ohio's FFY14 45 Day analysis.

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

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

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	8	1	0

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

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

FFY 2014 Data: All Indicator 8 Sections

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	10,175
Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	4,184

8A Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			94.03%	98.76%	97.50%	97.64%	99.22%	99.31%	100%	98.70%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

8A FFY 2014 Data

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data
268	273	98.17%

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2014. Ohio used monitoring data from a self-assessment to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. A representative sample from each of the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between January 1, 2015 and March 31, 2015 was included in Ohio's FFY14 Transition Steps analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which a representative sample of children with TPCs due between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were examined). Of the 273 child records examined, 268 (98.17 percent) were compliant. A total of one finding was issued to one EIS program; this finding was issued in FFY15.

The 268 child records counted as being compliant include 10 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 10 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were two Steps findings due for correction in FFY14, both of which were based on FFY13 data, issued in FFY13, and reported in the FFY13 APR. Both findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. ODH ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

State database

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

A selection of children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between January 1, 2015 and March 31, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY13 Transition Steps analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which a selection of children with TPCs due between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were examined).

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

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

8B Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	97.48%	90.22%	86.92%	97.40%	93.10%	97.82%	100%	99.92%

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

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

8B FFY 2014 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data
0	4,977	0%

Number of parents who opted out	462
---------------------------------	-----

Describe the method used to collect these data

Ohio created a data set from reports distributed to LEAs from local Help Me Grow EI programs. Reports were generated using Ohio’s statewide data system of all children turning three between February 1, 2015 and January 31, 2016 potentially eligible for Part B, excluding toddlers whose families opted out from notification (462 families opted out, which are not included in the numerator or denominator). Currently, counties are required to send quarterly reports to the LEA (due February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st each year) that include all children who will be turning three within a year from the report due date, as long as the family provides consent to share information. Counties are then required to submit proof of doing so to ODH for the February 1 report, which we use for our compliance analysis. Of 4,977 toddlers turning three in the referenced time frame and whose families did not opt out of notification, the LEAs were informed in a timely manner for all 4,977. 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.

ODH ensured notification to the LEA occurred as required, but continued to collaborate with the SEA in order to implement a plan for providing the quarterly data for all children turning age three to the SEA at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. Notification to the SEA did not occur for FFY14, but a plan was put in place and ODH is notifying the SEA on a quarterly basis as of the beginning of FFY15.

No findings were issued based on FFY14 data. One finding was due for correction in FFY14, which was based on FFY13 data and issued in FFY13, but not specifically reported on in the FFY13 APR. The finding was 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.

8B Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

8C Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data				89.32%	94.37%	97.64%	97.78%	99.32%	99.04%	96.47%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

8C FFY 2014 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data
537	543	98.90%

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

For compliance analyses, EIS programs were selected for Indicator 1, Indicator 7, or Indicators 8A and C. Ohio has implemented a monitoring cycle that ensures an even and representative selection of EIS programs each fiscal year for one of the aforementioned compliance indicators. All local programs have data analyzed for all of these compliance indicators within a three-year period.

Thirty EIS programs were scheduled to have their data for this indicator monitored for FFY 2014. Ohio used monitoring data from its data system (Early Track) as well as from the review and verification of a selection of records to determine its percent compliance for this indicator. All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between January 1, 2015 and March 31, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY14 Transition Planning Conference analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which all children with TPCs due between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were examined). Of the 543 child records examined, 537 (98.90 percent) were compliant. A total of one finding was issued to one EIS program; this finding was issued in FFY15.

The 537 child records counted as being compliant include 77 that were non-timely due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 77 child records are included in the numerator and denominator.

There were seven TPC findings due for correction in 2014, five of which were based on FFY13 data and reported in the FFY13 APR and two of which were based on FFY12 data and reported in the FFY12 APR, but issued during FFY13. All seven findings were corrected in a timely manner and verified in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. ODH ensured that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements

(i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

State database

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

All children among the 30 selected EIS programs who had Transition Planning Conferences due between January 1, 2015 and March 31, 2015 were included in Ohio's FFY14 Transition Planning Conference analysis (with the exception of one EIS program that had no applicable data for the time period, for which all children with TPCs due between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 were examined).

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

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

8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Data		N/A								

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	93.00%	N/A
Data		100%	100%	100%	50.00%	100%	N/A - no mediations			

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0	0



Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

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

1. Help Me Grow has helped me know my rights.	<input type="radio"/>				
2. Help Me Grow has helped me communicate my child's needs.	<input type="radio"/>				
3. Help Me Grow has helped me help my child learn and grow.	<input type="radio"/>				
4. I am comfortable participating in meetings with Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>				
5. I have helped develop my family's IFSP.	<input type="radio"/>				
6. Help Me Grow has helped me find opportunities to meet and interact with other families.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. Help Me Grow has treated me with respect.	<input type="radio"/>				
8. I am satisfied with the help that Help Me Grow has given me.	<input type="radio"/>				
9. I am able to see my child making progress in Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>				
10. I know what to do to file a complaint about Help Me Grow.	<input type="radio"/>				

Additional Comments:

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

- Mail Help Me Grow the survey in the included envelope. OR
- Go online to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/EIFamilyQuestionnaire2015> and answer the survey, using the ID at top of this page.

Please respond by October 30, 2015. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.

**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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)¹ under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the SPP/APR) is due no later than February 1, 2016.

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 (which is attached); or
2. Using the State's Part C SPP/APR for FFY 2014 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 SPP/APR for accuracy and completeness.²

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

Jessica Dumas
Signature of ICC Chairperson

1/25/16
Date

jndcolumbus@gmail.com

Address or e-mail
(614) 354-0741
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 SPP/APR must report on the State's performance under its SPP/APR 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 SPP/APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in the State's Part C SPP/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 1, 2016.