



MISSOURI SPECIAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN SAMPLE DISTRICT PROFILE

SAMPLE DISTRICT (555-555)

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, the Missouri State Performance Plan (SPP) is a six-year plan that includes targets for student performance indicators and improvement activities designed to enable districts* and the state to meet those targets. Missouri is also required to publicly report on the performance of each district in relation to the targets established in the SPP. The State Performance Plan can be found online at:

<http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/PDF/PartB-SPPMissouri.pdf>

The purpose of this profile is to:

- a. Provide information to the public about the performance of districts on the SPP Indicators
- b. Address other outcome measures for students receiving special education services.

Page one of this profile summarizes whether the district met or did not meet the targets for each performance indicator. The remaining pages provide additional data for the SPP indicators (noted as "SPP #").

Students with disabilities are those students who qualify for special education services and who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Data sources are provided for each table included in this profile, however most of the data are reported by the district directly to DESE.

All data are from the 2006-2007 school year unless otherwise noted.

*The word "district" includes responsible public agencies such as local school districts, charter schools and state operated programs.

Questions? Please contact the Division of Special Education - Data Coordination at 573-526-0299 or via email at webrepliespedc@dese.mo.gov.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to Department programs and to the location of services, activities, and facilities that are accessible by persons with disabilities may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Civil Rights Compliance (Title VI/Title IX/504/ADA/Age Act), 205 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480; telephone number 573-526-4757 or Relay Missouri 800-735-2966.

SPP Targets and District Status

SPP Indicator*	District Data 2006-07		Target	Target 2010-11
Early Childhood Special Education Data				
Percent of children referred by First Steps prior to age 3, who are found eligible for ECSE, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays (SPP 12)	83.33%	**	= 100.00%	= 100.00%
Child Count and Placement Data				
Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class at least 80% of the day (SPP 5a)	61.78%	Met	~ 60.00%	~ 64.00%
Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class less than 40% of the day (SPP 5b)	11.06%	Not Met	~ 10.90%	~ 10.50%
Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings (SPP 5c)	2.37%	Met	~ 3.45%	~ 3.20%
Was district identified as having disproportionality of racial/ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification? (SPP 9/10)	No			
Assessment Data				
Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessment for Communication Arts (grades 3-8, 11) (SPP 3b)	94.63%	Not Met	~ 95.00%	= 100.00%
Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessment for Mathematics (grades 3-8, 10) (SPP 3b)	96.87%	Met	~ 95.00%	= 100.00%
Proficiency rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessment for Communication Arts (grades 3-8, 11) (SPP 3c)	17.11 %	Not Met	~ 42.90%	~ 75.50%
Proficiency rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessment for Mathematics (grades 3-8, 10) (SPP 3c)	22.09%	Not Met	~ 35.80%	~ 72.50%
Evaluation Data				
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (SPP 11)	78.95%	**	= 100.00%	100.00%
Suspension/Expulsion Data				
Was district identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates? (SPP 4a)	Yes			
Secondary Transition Data				
Graduation rate for students with disabilities (SPP 1)	74.70%	Met	~ 74.00%	~ 78.50%
Dropout rate for students with disabilities (SPP 2)	5.71 %	Not Met	~ 4.50%	~ 3.80%
Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals (SPP 13)	33.33%	**	= 100.00%	100.00%

* Only those indicators for which data are available and/or targets have been established are included in this summary

** Data are collected from districts in the year prior to their MSIP review, so data is not available for all districts. For districts with data, the met/not met call is pending finalization of the compliance desk review of district data

Early Childhood Education (ECSE) Data

Early Childhood Special Education Child Count and Participation Rates

The following indicates the number of children who are eligible to receive early childhood special education services.

Total Early Childhood 3-pK5		
	Child Count	Participation Rate
2004-05	185	4.90%
2005-06	201	5.32%
2006-07	185	4.90%
State 2006-07	10,847	5.81 %

Source: District reported data from Core Data Screen 11 and census data (2003 estimates) Participation Rate = Child Count / Census

Early Childhood Special Education Placements (ages 3-pK5) (SPP 6)

The following indicates the settings in which children are receiving early childhood special education services.

Placements	2006-2007		State
	#	%	2006-2007 %
In the regular early childhood program at least 80%	63	34.05%	47.51 %
In the regular early childhood program 40-79%	25	13.51 %	12.68%
In the regular early childhood program less than 40%	0	0.00%	3.06%
Separate Class	71	38.38%	25.59%
Separate School	4	2.16%	1.83%
Residential Facility	0	0.00%	0.04%
Home	2	1.08%	1.45%
Service Provider location	20	10.81 %	7.85%
Total Early Childhood	185	100.00%	100.00%

Source: District reported data from Core Data Screen 11 Percentage = Placement / Total Placements

Transition from First Steps (Part C) (SPP 12)

For children referred from the First Steps program, districts are required to develop and implement an IEP by the third birthday. The following data shows the percent of children referred by First Steps prior to age 3, who were found eligible for ECSE, and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday

Reporting Year	Number referred and eligible	IEPs developed within acceptable timelines	Percent developed within acceptable timelines*	State 2005-2006 %
2006-07	24	20	83.33%	95.77%

Source: Data are collected from districts in the year prior to MSIP review; therefore not available for all districts every year

Early Childhood Outcome Data (SPP 7)

Data will be included in this report beginning in the 2008-2009 school year.

Child Count and Placement Data

Child Count (5k-21) and Parentally-Placed Private School Students (PPPS)

The following table indicates the number and incidence rate of students with disabilities by disability category.

Disability Category	Total	PPPS	Total Excluding PPPS	Incidence Rate 2006-07	State 2006-07
Mental Retardation	93	0	93	0.53%	1.29%
Emotional Disturbance	201	0	201	1.15%	0.91 %
Speech/Language Impairment	538	17	521	2.97%	4.05%
Orthopedic Impairment	6	0	6	0.03%	0.07%
Visual Impairment	8	0	8	0.05%	0.05%
Hearing Impairment	21	0	21	0.12%	0.15%
Specific Learning Disabilities	903	2	901	5.13%	5.35%
Other Health Impairment	158	1	157	0.89%	1.74%
Deaf/Blindness	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Multiple Disabilities	21	0	21	0.12%	0.16%
Autism	83	0	83	0.47%	0.50%
Traumatic Brain Injury	1	0	1	0.01%	0.05%
Young Child w/ Developmental Delay	97	4	93	0.53%	0.19%
Total	2,130	24	2,106	12.00%	14.43%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screens 11 and 16. Child Count data is as of December 1 Incidence rate = Total excluding PPPS / enrollment

School-age Placements (SPP 5)

The following table indicates the amount of time that students with disabilities are included in the regular education classroom.

Placement Categories	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007		State 2006-2007
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
Inside Regular Class >79% (SPP 5a)	1,474	62.78%	1,314	59.70%	1,301	61.78%	57.07%
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	564	24.02%	580	26.35%	522	24.79%	26.67%
Inside Regular Class <40% (SPP 5b)	247	10.52%	262	11.90%	233	11.06%	10.58%
Private Separate (Day) Facility*	2	0.09%	11	0.50%	10	0.47%	0.76%
Public Separate (Day) Facility*	57	2.43%	31	1.41 %	39	1.85%	1.43%
Homebound/Hospital*	4	0.17%	3	0.14%	1	0.05%	0.51 %
Private Residential Facility*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.01 %
Correctional Facility	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0.00%	0.10%
Parentally Placed Private School	N/A	N/A	14	0.64%	24	1.14%	1.96%
State Operated Separate School^	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.92%
Total School Age	2,348	100.00%	2,201	100.00%	2,106	100.00%	100.00%
Total of Separate Placements* (SPP 5c)				6 3 2			2.70%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screen 11

**"Total Separate" includes: Private/Public Separate Facilities; Homebound/Hospital; Private Residential Facilities and State Operated Separate School ^This category is only used by Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf and State School for the Severely Handicapped

Percent of Students by Race/Ethnicity (SPP 9/10)

The following table indicates the percentage of students by race for total district enrollment, special education child count and disability categories (special education data excludes PPPS students)

	White %	Black %	Hispanic	%Asian%	Indian %	Total %
Total District Enrollment (K-12)	73.35%	11.19%	10.23%	3.99%	1.24%	100.00%
Total IEP Child Count (3-21)	78.52%	10.17%	7.94%	1.92%	1.44%	100.00%
Mental Retardation	70.97%	9.68%	9.68%	8.60%	1.08%	100.00%
Emotional Disturbance	82.59%	10.45%	5.47%	0.00%	1.49%	100.00%
Speech/Language Impairment	76.97%	8.83%	9.02%	3.07%	2.11%	100.00%
Specific Learning Disability	79.80%	10.32%	7.99%	0.55%	1.33%	100.00%
Other Health Impairment	84.08%	8.92%	3.18%	0.64%	3.18%	100.00%
Autism	78.31 %	7.23%	13.25%	1.20%	0.00%	100.00%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screens 11 and 16

Student Assessment Data

Missouri Assessment Program (IEP MAP and MAP-Alternate) (SPP 3b and 3c)

The following table indicates statewide assessment results for students with disabilities.

2005-06 IEP MAP and MAP-A	Grade	Accountable	Participation Rate (SPP 3b)	Proficient or Advanced % (SPP 3c)	State Proficient or Advanced %
Communication Arts	3	194	97.94%	23.20%	23.30%
Communication Arts	4	192	99.48%	26.20%	21.80%
Communication Arts	5	181	97.79%	23.20%	18.60%
Communication Arts	6	170	98.82%	12.50%	14.50%
Communication Arts	7	185	95.14%	12.50%	12.10%
Communication Arts	8	168	97.02%	11.00%	10.90%
Communication Arts	11	144	90.28%	12.30%	10.10%
Communication Arts	3-5	567	98.41 %	24.19%	21.25%
Communication Arts	6-8	523	96.94%	12.03%	12.48%
Communication Arts	All	1234	96.84%	17.74%	16.22%
Mathematics	3	193	100.00%	39.40%	28.90%
Mathematics	4	192	99.48%	27.20%	25.30%
Mathematics	5	181	98.34%	25.80%	20.80%
Mathematics	6	170	99.41 %	18.30%	17.70%
Mathematics	7	185	98.38%	14.80%	14.10%
Mathematics	8	168	98.21 %	13.90%	13.00%
Mathematics	10	168	97.02%	11.70%	10.40%
Mathematics	3-5	566	99.29%	30.96%	25.02%
Mathematics	6-8	523	98.66%	15.70%	14.90%
Mathematics	All	1257	98.73%	22.08%	18.80%
2005-06 IEP MAP and MAP-A	Grade	Accountable	Participation Rate (SPP 3b)	Proficient or Advanced % (SPP 3c)	State Proficient or Advanced %
Communication Arts	3	184	95.11 %	22.30%	23.70%
Communication Arts	4	185	97.30%	26.10%	22.90%
Communication Arts	5	171	95.91 %	22.60%	20.10%
Communication Arts	6	166	95.18%	13.30%	15.90%
Communication Arts	7	168	92.86%	14.70%	13.70%
Communication Arts	8	177	94.35%	9.60%	10.70%
Communication Arts	11	141	90.78%	7.80%	9.70%
Communication Arts	3-5	540	96.11 %	23.70%	22.26%
Communication Arts	6-8	511	94.13%	12.47%	13.43%
Communication Arts	All	1192	94.63%	17.11 %	17.07%
Mathematics	3	184	95.65%	34.70%	28.80%
Mathematics	4	187	98.40%	28.30%	26.30%
Mathematics	5	172	96.51 %	24.10%	23.20%
Mathematics	6	166	95.78%	22.00%	20.30%
Mathematics	7	168	96.43%	20.40%	16.80%
Mathematics	8	176	98.30%	12.10%	13.60%
Mathematics	10	162	96.91 %	11.50%	11.10%
Mathematics	3-5	543	96.87%	29.09%	26.16%
Mathematics	6-8	510	96.86%	18.02%	16.86%
Mathematics	All	1215	96.87%	22.09%	20.28%

Source: MAP Assessment - includes MAP and MAP-A results

Evaluation, Parent Involvement and Suspension/Expulsion Data

District Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Students with Disabilities (SPP 3a)

Student assessment data is evaluated for AYP purposes for a specific subgroups of students, one of which is students with disabilities. For district AYP status, refer to School Data and Statistics website: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>

Initial Evaluation Timelines (SPP 11)

Districts are required to complete initial evaluations and determine eligibility within 60 days from referral to special education. The following table reflects the percent of children who, with parental consent, had eligibility for special education determined within 60 days.

Reporting Year	Number evaluated	Number within acceptable timelines	Percent within acceptable timelines*	State 2005-2006
2006-07	57	45	78.95%	94.74%

Note: Data collected from districts in year prior to MSIP review; therefore not available for all districts every year Statewide reporting includes approximately 1/5 of all school districts in the state *Pending finalization of the Special Education Compliance review

Parent Survey Data (SPP 8)

Parents are asked about their level of involvement with their children's education on the MSIP Parent Survey. The following table indicates the percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools encouraged parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Reporting Year	Total Responses	Number Agree/ Strongly Agree	% Agree/ Strongly Agree	State 2006-2007
2006-07	1204	1056	87.71 %	69.42%

Source: MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire

Note: Data collected from districts in year prior to MSIP review; therefore not available for all districts every year Statewide reporting includes approximately 1/5 of all school districts in the state

Suspension/Expulsion Data (SPP 4a)

School Year 2006-2007	District					State				
	Students IEP		Students NonIEP		Ratio of IEP : NonIEP rate	Students IEP		Students NonIEP		Ratio of IEP : NonIEP rate
	#	Rate per 100 students	#	Rate per 100 students		#	Rate per 100 students	#	Rate per 100 students	
OSS - All	310	14.7	1,009	6.5	2.25	14,809	11.6	46,717	6.1	1.91
OSS > 10 Days	47	2.2	142	0.9	2.43	3,059	2.4	8,467	1.1	2.18
ISS - All	352	16.7	1,483	9.6	1.74	19,316	15.1	78,307	10.1	1.49
ISS > 10 Days	27	1.3	92	0.6	2.15	2,354	1.8	7,121	0.9	1.99
Total OSS and ISS	662	31.4	2,492	16.1	1.95	34,125	26.7	125,024	16.2	1.65
	Incidents IEP		Incidents nonIEP		Ratio of IEP : NonIEP rate	Incidents IEP		Incidents nonIEP		Ratio of IEP : NonIEP rate
	#	Rate per 100 students	#	Rate per 100 students		#	Rate per 100 students	#	Rate per 100 students	
OSS - All	605	28.7	1,610	10.4	2.76	30,260	23.6	83,128	10.8	2.19
OSS > 10 Days	47	2.2	144	0.9	2.39	3,300	2.6	9,008	1.2	2.21
ISS - All	771	36.6	2,731	17.7	2.07	50,901	39.8	184,691	23.9	1.66
ISS > 10 Days	27	1.3	92	0.6	2.15	2,387	1.9	7,217	0.9	1.99
Total OSS and ISS	1,376	65.3	4,341	28.1	2.32	81,161	63.4	267,819	34.7	1.83

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screens 9, 11 and 16

is the number of students or incidents reported; rate is the rate per 100 students based on total enrollment and 5k-21 child count excluding PPPS ISS All = Any incident resulting in an in-school suspension

ISS > 10 days = Any incident resulting in an in-school suspension for more than 10 consecutive or cumulative days

OSS All = Any incident resulting in an out of school suspension

OSS >10 days = Any incident resulting in an out of school suspension for more than 10 consecutive or cumulative days

OSS includes out of school suspensions, expulsions or unilateral removals

Secondary Transition Data

Graduation / Dropout Data for Students with Disabilities (SPP 1, 2)

The following table indicates the numbers and percents of students with disabilities who graduate or drop out from school.

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	*State 2006-07
Graduation data (SPP 1)				
Number of students with disabilities who graduated	117	127	124	6,628
Graduation rate for students with disabilities	73.13%	69.02%	74.70%	74.13%
Dropout data (SPP 2)				
Number of students with disabilities ages 14 - 21	803	775	736	46,310
Number of students with disabilities who dropped out	43	57	42	2,313
Dropout rate for students with disabilities	5.35%	7.35%	5.71 %	4.99%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screens 12 and 11

Graduation rate = Graduates / (Graduates + Dropouts) x 100

Dropout rate = Dropouts / 14-21 Child Count x 100

For students ages 14-21 the following exit categories are combined for the number of dropouts: 03-Received a Certificate, 04-Reached Max Age, 07-Moved, Not known to continue and 08-Dropped out

NA - Elementary districts do not report their high school students, therefore will not have a graduation or dropout rate.

*Totals exclude data reported by Dept of Corrections and Division of Youth Services

Secondary Transition Plans (SPP 13)

IEPs must include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post-secondary goals. The following data show the percent of youth age 16 and above with a transition plan that meets these requirements as determined by file review of a sample of IEPs.

Reporting Year	Total Reviewed	Number Met	Percent Met*	State 2005-06
2006-07	15	5	33.33%	44.78%

Note: Data collected from districts in year prior to MSIP review; therefore not available for all districts every year Statewide reporting includes approximately 1/5 of all school districts in the state * Pending finalization of the Special Education Compliance review

Follow-up on Previous Year's Graduates (IEP) (SPP 14)

Districts are required to follow-up with all graduates six months after graduation. The following table indicates the district-reported data.

	2005 Graduates		2006 Graduates		State 2006 Graduates	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
4 - Year College	15	12.82%	12	9.45%	764	11.77%
2 - Year College	34	29.06%	48	37.80%	1,553	23.93%
Non - College	9	7.69%	12	9.45%	426	6.56%
Military	4	3.42%	8	6.30%	198	3.05%
Employment	49	41.88%	32	25.20%	2,278	35.11 %
Other	6	5.13%	9	7.09%	495	7.63%
Unknown	3	2.56%	6	4.72%	474	7.30%
Total Employed / Continuing Education	111	94.87%	112	88.19%	5,219	80.43%
Total Follow-up	120	102.56%	127	100.00%	6,188	0.00%
Not reported	-3	-2.56%	0	0.00%	301	4.64%
Total Graduates	117	100.00%	127	100.00%	6,489	100.00%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screen 08

Total Employed & Continuing Education = Sum of (4-year and 2-year college, non-college, military and employment) / graduates

MISSOURI SPECIAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN SAMPLE

LEA: Anywhere District

Contact Person: Mary Dwyer
Phone: 573-555-5555
email: medwyer@districtname.k12.mo.us

SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Anywhere District gathered a group of relevant Stakeholders to guide the Improvement Planning process. The Stakeholder group included the Assistant Superintendent, special education director, the district test coordinator, an elementary principal, an elementary general education teacher, an elementary special education teacher, a parent who volunteers frequently in the elementary school, and a representative from the Anywhere Bank (our Partners in Education sponsor). The Stakeholder group would be responsible for guiding the Improvement Planning process and strategy implementation over the course of the three-year proposed plan. The Stakeholder group reviewed the data available from the State Special Education Profile and the general education MAP data disaggregated by school, grade, and subgroup, and local district data, including Stanford 10 scores, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) scores for grades 3-5, rates of discipline referrals to principals, information on the district reading curriculum and mathematics curriculum, and information on the types of elementary academic intervention programs currently in place. A data drilldown process was used to look for patterns in the data that might suggest why students with disabilities are not achieving academically at the level necessary to meet the State SPP Indicator levels. The group determined that the district was not meeting the SPP Indicator goal in Assessment and Placements. Trend data showed that small gains had been made in meeting these goals in Communication Arts, Math, and Placement rates, but the increases were not adequate and were far below the increases shown by non-special education students. After review of the data, the Stakeholder group determined that additional information was needed and conducted focus groups with general and special education teachers to identify what school specific factors were contributing to the low academic scores of students in each elementary school.

After completion of the focus groups, the Stakeholder group met again and re-reviewed the state and local district data in conjunction with the new information gathered. Based upon this data analysis, the group determined that the literacy programs and specific interventions for students in early grades were not sufficient to meet the needs of students who had difficulties learning to read. This could prevent students in special education from developing good basic reading skills that would then carryover to the 3rd through 5th grade when MAP and MAP-A tests are given. Additionally, this could prevent students from having more minutes in general education classes due to their low reading levels. Based upon this hypothesis, the following prioritized needs were determined:

1. Improve the K-3 literacy curriculum.
2. Implement universal screening measures to evaluate the progress of all students in the curriculum.
3. Develop a system of interventions to target specific skill deficits shown by all students.

GOAL 1: STUDENT PERFORMANCE

OBJECTIVE #1

The Anywhere School District will increase the percent of students with disabilities in grade three who score in the Advanced/ Proficient levels on the MAP Communication Arts from 15% to 60% by the 2011-2012 school year.

Related SPP Indicators (mark all related indicators)

- Assessment (SPP 3)
- Discipline (SPP 4)
- Disproportionality (SPP 9/10)
- Dropout (SPP 2)
- Early Childhood Outcomes (SPP 7)
- Evaluation Timelines (SPP 11)
- Graduation (SPP 1)
- Parent Involvement (SPP 8)
- Placements (SPP 5)
- Placements – Early Childhood (SPP 6)
- Post-Secondary Outcomes (SPP 14)
- Post-Secondary Transition Plans (SPP 13)
- Transition into Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) (SPP 12)

Progress Measures

Year	Type	Percentage/Number
2007-2008	Baseline	15%
2008-2009	Target (Intermediate)	20%
2009-2010	Target (Intermediate)	35%
2010-2011	Target (Intermediate)	50%
2011-2012	Target	60%

Comments: Monitoring of Objective

MAP data for the special education subgroup will be gathered yearly and a report of the data will be submitted to the Stakeholder group. The Stakeholder group will evaluate the data to determine progress made toward the goal by the 3rd grade special education students. If progress is not made or is insufficient to meet the intermediate targets, then the Stakeholder group will decide how the strategies need to be changed or if the strategy is being implemented as planned. Adjustments to the strategy will be made in order to improve progress toward the goals.

STRATEGY 1.1

Implementation of Program ABC principles in grades K-3

Person(s) Responsible for Supervision of the Strategy: Darla Breard, Assistant Superintendent and R. Greene, Reading Coordinator

Funding Source: Special Education Competitive Grant – Elementary Achievement

Date to Implement Strategy: 4/1/2011

Date of Completion: 5/31/2014

Apply Strategy to Plan: CSIP, Special Education Improvement Plan

Comments: Rationale for Selection of Strategy and Buildings Where the Strategy Will Be Implemented

Incorporating Program ABC principles as a guide for our CA curriculum will allow us to meet the needs of most students in the general classroom setting and to teach all of the five skills required for good readers, develop interventions for specific student skill deficits, and implement a system of universal screening/progress monitoring as these are all components of Reading First.

In an effort to ensure that all staff would be willing and open to extensive training and implementation of the Program ABC principles, staff meetings were held at each school with members of the Stakeholder group in attendance to answer questions and discuss the value of using the program to improve student learning. The staff was informed that the entire process would be completed over the course of 3 years. After the staff meetings, a vote was held by private ballot to determine the number of teachers who were willing to commit to the process of implementation. The voting indicated that 92% of the teachers were actively willing to commit to the Program ABC principles.

Program ABC will be implemented in all three district elementary buildings grades K-5 (or list the individual names of each building).

Activity 1.1 Action Steps

Action Step	Date to Implement	Date of Completion
Select personnel to plan and lead implementation of Program ABC principles. Include teachers and administrators from each school.	4/1/11	4/11/11
Planning group will meet monthly to monitor rate of implementation	4/2/011	5/31/11
Contract with Program ABC trainer/consultant from the RPDC. Set dates for initial trainings and follow-up consultation	4/1/11	4/8/11
Planning group will research and select core reading program.	5/2/11	6/31/11
Order/purchase of core reading program. Need resources to purchase	7/1/11	7/1/11
Planning group to research and develop 3-tiered system of interventions based on needs of district and the resources available. Interventions to be developed in all 5 areas of reading skills	6/1/12	8/15/12
Hold trainings: 6 days of XYZ, 1 day on 3-tiered model, 1 day on differentiated instruction and behavior management, 1 day on DIBELS administration, 2 days on use of new core curriculum. Need resources for stipends	7/1/11	5/31/12
Hold trainings: 3 days of XYZ, 2 days follow-up	9/1/11	5/31/12
Training of Title I reading teachers in the process of being a reading coach/consultant for district staff. Training is for 7 days prior to the start of school. Need resources for stipends	7/1/11	8/20/11
Additional training for reading teachers (2 days during school year)	8/20/11	5/31/12
Implement core reading program, XYZ, 3-tiered interventions and differentiated instruction (Program ABC principles)	8/20/11	5/31/14
Monthly meetings with reading teachers/coaches and RPDC consultant to discuss issues related to coaching in the classroom and to receive follow-up training	9/1/11	5/31/14
Weekly meetings with reading coaches and teachers to problem solve and ensure correct implementation of programs	8/20/11	5/31/14
IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MEASURE: Structured observations conducted quarterly by reading coaches to ensure implementation as planned for core reading program, XYZ, DI, interventions and behavior management strategies	9/1/11	5/31/14

Action Step	Date to Implement	Date of Completion
Reports of data collected and progress made delivered to stakeholder group quarterly	10/31/11	5/31/14
Reports to DESE made as required (twice a year)	1/1/12	7/31/14
IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MEASURE: Training surveys to be completed by staff at the end of each training to evaluate perceptions of usefulness of training and the comfort level with using the material	7/1/11	5/31/12
STUDENT PROGRESS MEASURE Implement quarterly DIBELS assessments. Use data to screen students to determine who needs further intervention. Need resources for purchasing assessments. Send results of quarterly progress assessments to parents.	9/1/11	4/30/14
STUDENT PROGRESS MEASURE: Implement weekly DIBELS assessments for progress monitoring for students in tiered interventions	9/1/11	5/31/14
STUDENT PROGRESS MEASURE: Administer Stanford 10 annually to evaluate student reading progress. Provide results to parents at parent-teacher conference.	9/1/11	10/1/14

Activity 1.1 Budget

Category	Subcategory	Detail	Notes	Budget Amount
Purchased Services	Professional and technical services	Instructional program and improvement services	Trainer/Consultant from RPDC for 6 days of XYZ training in summer for 32 teachers at \$25/teacher/day to reimburse RPDC for expenses	\$4,800
Salaries	Certified	Supplemental Pay	Stipends for 6 days of training prior to the beginning of the school year for 32 teachers K-3, at \$100/day	\$19,200
Total:				\$24,000

STRATEGY 1.2

Implementation of co-teaching in grades 3-5

Person(s) Responsible for Supervision of the Strategy: Darla Breard, Assistant Superintendent and Vicky Lane, Special Education Director

Funding Source: Special Education Competitive Grant – Elementary Achievement

Date to Implement Strategy: 5/1/2011

Date of Completion: 5/31/2014

Apply Strategy to Plan: CSIP, Special Education Improvement Plan

Comments: Rationale for Selection of Strategy and Buildings Where the Strategy Will Be Implemented

The co-teaching model will support the implementation of the Program ABC principles by using the expertise of special education staff to ensure that students with disabilities are benefiting from the use of Program ABC

principles in the general classroom environment. Grades 3-5 were selected as grades K-2 have more intensive support from the Reading Coaches than do the higher level grades. Use of the co-teaching model will also support the ability of students with disabilities to stay in the general education classroom for longer periods of time.

A discussion group was held with general and special education teachers in grades 3-5 about the advantages and disadvantages of co-teaching. The group was very excited about the advantages to student learning available with the use of a co-teaching model and 97% of the group voted to support the implementation.

Evidence Base

District personnel reviewed the research literature available on co-teaching. The use of co-teaching is advocated by The Access Center, a technical assistance center of the U.S. Department of Education, on their website. According to the information on the website, co-teaching is a way to enhance access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities.

The following research based articles found in peer-reviewed journals on the Kansas University website (www.specialconnections.ku.edu) were reviewed:

J. Bauwens (1991). Making co-teaching a mainstreaming strategy. *Preventing School Failure*, 35(4), 19-24.

C. Walther-Thomas, (1996). Planning for effective co-teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 17(4), 255-266.

V. Austin (2001). Teachers beliefs about co-teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(4), 245-255.

W. Murawski & H. Swanson (2001). A meta-analysis of co-teaching research: Where is the data?, *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(5), 258-267.

The summary of the data indicates that co-teaching is an effective instructional practice if implemented correctly. Murawski and Swanson (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of the co-teaching research and found that effect sizes for the use of co-teaching ranged in individual studies from low (.24) to high (.95), showing a broad range of outcomes. Most of the research reviewed suggested that the highest level of outcomes were found when co-teaching was implemented correctly and when the general and special educators co-planned and taught the lessons and activities in the classroom. Walther-Thomas (1996) found that co-planning between both parties in the dyad was the key to successfully working together. Bauwens (1991) stated that co-teaching benefits both teachers and students. It allows teachers to help students while avoiding labeling and stigmatizing students in special education, while also allowing teachers to best serve a diverse learning population in the general education classroom. The Anywhere District is committed to implementation of co-teaching with fidelity in order to ensure that the strategy will be the most successful. Therefore, fidelity of implementation measures will be carefully collected and examined. If needed, adjustments or further training will be done.

Co-teaching will be implemented in all five district elementary buildings grades K-5.

Action Steps

Action Step	Date to Implement	Date of Completion
Select personnel to plan and lead implementation of co-teaching. Include teachers and administrators from each school.	5/1/11	5/9/11
Planning group will meet monthly to monitor rate of implementation	6/2/11	5/31/14
Contract with co-teaching trainer from RPDC. Set dates for initial training and follow-up consultation	5/1/11	5/8/11

Action Step	Date to Implement	Date of Completion
One day training for selected general and special education teachers and principals before school starts. Resources for stipends needed.	7/1/11	7/30/11
Implement co-teaching in selected 3rd-5th grade classes	8/20/11	5/31/14
IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MEASURE: Conduct structured observations quarterly by principals to determine whether the co-teaching principles are being adhered to by teachers and to evaluate any problems in implementation	9/1/11	5/31/14
IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MEASURE: Monthly teacher groups to allow discussion of implementation problems and get advice from the co-teaching consultant if needed. Planning group members will attend to monitor problems associated with implementation and to gather qualitative information about teacher concerns and suggested changes	9/1/11	5/31/14
Reports of data collected and progress made delivered to stakeholder group quarterly	10/31/11	5/31/14
Reports to DESE made as required (twice a year)	1/1/12	7/31/14
IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY MEASURE: Quarterly anonymous teacher surveys to evaluate implementation of the co-teaching methods. Items will include info on the role of each teacher in the development of lesson plans and teaching strategies	10/1/11	5/31/14
STUDENT PROGRESS MEASURE: Conduct student grade checks every three weeks for students with disabilities in co-teaching classrooms as well as for nondisabled students. Send grade checks to parents.	9/1/11	5/31/14

Activity 1.2 Budget

Category	Subcategory	Detail	Notes	Budget Amount
Purchased Services	Professional and technical services	Instructional program and improvement services	Trainer/Consultant from RPDC for 1 days training in summer for 20 teachers and administrators at \$25/teacher/day to reimburse RPDC for expenses	\$500
Salaries	Certified	Supplemental Pay	Stipends for 1 day of training prior to the beginning of the school year for 20 teachers and administrators, at \$100/day	\$2,000
			Total:	\$2,500

Special Education Improvement Grant Program Resources/Spending Guidelines

School Improvement Initiatives

Grant funding may be used to implement or scale up the following school improvement initiatives:

- Response to Intervention (RtI)
- Schoolwide - Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS)
- Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
- High Schools That Work (HSTW)
- Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)
- Technology Centers That Work (TCTW)
- Check and Connect (C & C)
- Transition Outcomes Project (TOP)

More information about these school improvement initiatives can be found at: www.dese.mo.gov

Progress Monitoring

Progress monitoring tools can be found at:

- Research Institute on Progress Monitoring
www.progressmonitoring.org
- National Center on Student Progress Monitoring
<http://www.studentprogress.org/>

**NOTE:* The Department is not endorsing any specific

Expenditure Categories

- **Salaries/Stipends**
(ex. NO FTEs- allowed/ stipends-approvable)
- **Purchased Services**
(ex. Transportation/ travel; presenter fee; workshop fee; speaker/ presenter; printing, copying; trainer; facilities; catering)
- **Supplies and Materials**
(ex. Curricula; evaluation supplies; store-bought food; professional books; student incentives, textbooks; student planners; postage, etc.
**NOTE: Technology approved on case-by-case basis to supplement improvement initiatives only!)*

Spending Caps
Incentives: 5% total budget
Food: 6% total budget

Evidence/Research Based Programs

The Office of Special Education is not endorsing specific programs for grant funding, however proposals must be for evidence/research-based programs. A list of some available resources for evidence based practices are:

- What Works Clearinghouse
<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia
<http://www.bestevidence.org/>
- Florida Center for Reading Research
<http://www.fcrr.org/>

More resources can be found at
www.dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/ebpc/resources

* It is always recommended that caution be exercised when examining information from any of the websites named. Study results should be read carefully to examine the extent to which specific areas of instruction are included the reviewed program. Specific student needs should be determined and then review/select programs that offer adequate evidence of effectiveness in those exact areas of need. By matching specific student needs and programs that offer evidence of effectiveness in meeting those particular needs, the most powerful intervention plan may be developed.

Spending requests not located in suggested resources will require justification that describes the research base and the effectiveness for the particular purpose and target population.

OSEP Part B State Performance Plan Indicators

(Requires public reporting of state and district-level data)

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:
 - A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
 - B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
 - C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:
 - A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
 - B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:
 - A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
 - B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
 - C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:
 - A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
 - B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
 - A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
 - B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
 - C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:
 - A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
 - B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
 - C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.
15. 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.
16. 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

**Missouri Part B - State Performance Plan Targets
2005-2006 through 2010-2011**

SPP Indicator	Performance Measure	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	2010-2011
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1	Graduation rate for students with disabilities ¹	≥73.0%	70.3% 73.5%*	74.0%	72.8% 75.2%*	75.0%	80.0%	74.0%		74.5%	75.0%
2	Dropout rate for students with disabilities ¹	≤4.7%	5.6% 4.9%*	4.5%	5.7% 4.7%*	4.3%	4.9%	5.0%		4.9%	4.8%
3a	Percent of districts meeting AYP (combined Comm Arts and Math)	≥30.0%	32.2%	33.0%	10.6%	34.0%	18.3%	35.0%	35.1%	35.0%	37.0%
3b	Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments	≥95.0%	99.3%	95.0%	99.3%	95.0%	99.5%	96.0%	99.6%	95.0%	95.0%
3c	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments	CA: ≥34.7% Math: ≥26.6%	15.9% 18.7%	CA: 42.9% Math: 35.8%	17.6% 20.9%	CA: 51.0% Math: 45.0%	19.1% 22.7%	CA: 68.2% Math: 54.1%	23.8% 25.8%	CA: 67.4% Math: 63.3%	CA: 78.5% Math: 73.5%
4a	Percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates ¹	≤1.7%	0.57%	1.5%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%		0.8%	0.5%
4b	Percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates by race/ethnicity	N/A	0.57%	≤0.5%	N/A	0.5%	N/A	0.5%		0.5%	0.4%
5a	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day	≥59.0%	57.4%	60.0%	55.8%	59.0%	57.1%	58.5%	58.0%	59.0%	59.5%
5b	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day	≤11.0%	11.2%	10.9%	10.6%	10.9%	10.0%	10.2%	9.8%	10.3%	10.2%
5c	Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings	≤3.50%	3.70%	3.45%	3.70%	3.40%	3.7%	3.60%	3.6%	3.55%	3.50%
6	Percent of children ages 3-5 with IEPs in settings with typically developing peers	≥43.0%	45.4%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7a	Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social/emotional skills (Two summary statements)	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	92.6%	83.3%	83.4%
7b	Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (Two summary statements)	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	83.7%	84.3%	84.4%
7c	Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs (Two summary statements)	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	42.3%	38.1%	38.2%
8	Percent of parents who report that school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	N/A	76.5%	≥77.0%	68.4%	72.5%	72.3%	75.0%	69.8%	77.5%	80.0%
9	Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	≤0.0%	1.15%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	≤0.0%	1.15%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation	≥100%	94.7%	100%	94.0%	100%	97.1%	100%	97.8%	100%	100%
12	Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	≥100%	95.4%	100%	80.3%	100%	88.5%	100%	91.3%	100%	100%
13	Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals	≥100%	44.8%	100%	73.2%	100%	82.5%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
14	Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school	N/A		N/A	73.5%	≥74.0%	74.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	Percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within 12 months	≥100%	32.3%	100%	95.4%	100%	100.0%	100%	99.9%	100%	100%
16	Percent of complaints resolved within 60 day or extended timelines	≥100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%
17	Percent of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines	≥100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	66.7%	100%	100%
18	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements	N/A	46.9%	≥50.0%	46.2%	35.0%	48.8%	35.1%	44.0%	35.2%	35.3%
19	Percent of mediations that result in a mediation agreement	≥62.0%	65.7%	62.5%	55.5%	35.0%	64.7%	35.1%	61.3%	35.2%	35.3%
20	Percent of state reported data that are timely and accurate	≥100.0%	93.0%	100.0%	99.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹ See Annual Performance Report for information on changes to the data reporting and calculation requirements.
² Second number is the graduation or dropout rate excluding data from Department of Corrections.
 For more information, see Missouri State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report for Part B at <http://www.doe.mo.gov/010/wsc40/SPPDocs.html>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of Special Education

LISTINGS OF DATA FOR CONSIDERATION

- **Purpose:** These listings are intended to assist a district with considering different types of data that might be used to support a needs assessment.
- **Organization of Data Lists:** Data are organized by Demographics, Student Learnings, School Processes and Perceptions, from Victoria L. Bernhardt's *Data Analysis for Comprehensive Schoolwide Improvement*, Eye on Education, Inc. 6 Depot Way West, Larchmont, NY 10538 (1998). Please note that some data can go under more than one category contingent upon use; and there are likely other data available to help the district assess their needs.

Definitions for these categories are as follows (Bernhardt):

- Demographics (typically quantitative data) – population characteristics.
- Student Learnings (typically quantitative data) – student achievement as measured by formal and informal assessment instruments.
- School Processes (qualitative and quantitative data) – how the processes of education are carried out via programs, procedures and decisions. These include but are not limited to policies, instruction, course offerings, interpersonal and group dynamics, delegation of responsibility, etc.
- Perceptions (typically qualitative data) – opinions, beliefs and judgments.

A Note About Locating and/or Gathering Data:

Multiple measures of building level data are available from your school district including those which you aggregate to a district and/or building level for reporting to the Core Data Collection System. Note that other data needed to complete a comprehensive analysis may need to be gathered or collected by your school district. Places to find multiple measures of data and information are listed below.

- Places to Find Data and Information:
 - ✓ School building level data collected by the district or the building
 - ✓ School district data at the student level collected by building to be reported to Core Data Collection System (including, but not limited to, screens 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 20)
 - ✓ MAP Clear Access/Crystal Reports
 - ✓ Special Education State and District Profiles
 - ✓ IEP Present Level of Performance from individual student IEPs
 - ✓ Special Education Monitoring/Compliance Report
 - ✓ District Off Grade Assessments (i.e. Terra Nova, SAT 10, etc.)
 - ✓ District Common Benchmark Assessments; any district assessments
 - ✓ MSIP Report
 - ✓ District Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)
 - ✓ Comprehensive Building Improvement Plans (CBIPs)
 - ✓ District Comprehensive System of Professional Development Plan (CSPD)
- Other Potential Places to Find Data and Information:
 - ✓ Missouri KIDS COUNT Data Book Online at <http://oseda.missouri.edu/>
 - ✓ Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis at <http://www.oseda.missouri.edu/>
 - ✓ IDEA Data at <http://www.ideadata.org/>
 - ✓ National Center for Education Statistics at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/>
 - ✓ NCLB School Results Data at <http://www.SchoolResults.org/>

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Demographics	Student Learnings	School Processes	Perceptions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Incidents by Type of Removal for Special Education and All Students (In-School, Out-of-School, Expulsions, Office Referrals) • Discipline Incidents for Special Education and All Students (Multiple short sessions, 10 Consecutive Days, Greater than 10 days, 45 Calendar Day Placements) • Free/Reduced Lunch Rate (District & Building) • Percent of Students Represented at Parent Teacher Conferences • Race/Ethnicity for Special Education Students and for All Students (District & Building) • Special Education Child Count, Placement and Incidence Rates by Disability and/or by Age • Special Education Early Childhood & School Age Placement Totals • Special Education Early Childhood & School Age Placement by Disability and/ or by Age • Staff/Educator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attendance (District & Building) ○ Staff/Educator Turnover Rate ○ Educator Vacancy; initial vacancies, appropriately certified, vacant all year • Student Attendance for Special Education Students and for All Students (District & Building) • Students with disabilities access to the general education curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to general education curriculum – special education students • Alternate programming available • District and/or Building Assessment Scores; reading, mathematics, communication arts (Elementary, Middle, High School) • Kindergarten Level Assessments (district and/or building) • MAP Scores (IEP and All by District, Building & Student) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MAP Alternate ○ Reading, Mathematics, and Communication Arts Achievement ○ MAP Assessment Data by Content and Grade Level and/or by Disability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Complaints; number, frequency, type, resolution (Special education students) • Disciplinary Policies • Inclusion practices: least restrictive environment, access to regular education, etc. • Number of Staff Recognitions per Quarter • Number of Student Recognitions per Quarter • Professional Development: percent of staff participating in high-quality staff development during the year • Special Education Referrals: Number of Referrals Accepted, Number of Referrals Placed • Student Service Team (SST) Referrals Resulting in Special Education Referral, Resulting in Placement • Staff Recruitment and Retention; hiring practices, organizational dynamics, working conditions, supervisory/management techniques, support systems, training, etc. • Transition planning practices: IEP, consultation, implementation, access, opportunities, etc. • MAP Oral Reading Accommodations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints (parent, student, staff, etc.); number, frequency, type, resolution • Focus Groups • Interviews (unbiased formal and/or informal instrument) • Observations (unbiased formal and/or informal instrument) • Questionnaires/Surveys: Student, Parent, Teacher, Administrator

POST-SECONDARY TRANSITION DATA

Demographics	Student Learnings	School Processes	Perceptions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A+ Participation: number 9-12, number of graduates • ACT: Number taking test • Advanced Placement: number of students enrolled, number who took the exam • Attendance data • Discipline Incidents by Type of Removal for Special Education and All Students (In-School, Out-of-School, Expulsions, Office Referrals) • Discipline Incidents by Length of Removal for Special Education and All Students • Disciplinary referrals for Special Education and All-who, what , where, when • Dropout Numbers/Rate for Special Education Students and for All Students • Dropout Numbers/Rates for Special Education Students by Disability, Age and/or Dropout Category • Dual Credit: number of students enrolled (unduplicated) • Duration in special education (from date of initial diagnosis to current year) • Free/Reduced Lunch Rate (District & Building) • Grade Distribution by Grade Level and subject (MS&HS) (especially failing grades) • Grade Distribution: Algebra 1 & English 9 • Graduation Follow-Up for Special Education Students and for All Students : 4 yr, 2 yr, non college, military, employment, unknown, other • Graduation Numbers/Rates for Special Education Students and for All Students • Graduation Numbers/Rates for Special Education Students by Disability and/or Age • Mobility Rate; Transfer Ins, Transfer Outs, Enrolled All Year • Percent of Students Represented at Parent Teacher Conferences • Race/Ethnicity for Special Education Students and for All Students (District & Building) • Special Education School Age Placement by Disability and/ or by Age • Staff/Educator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attendance (District & Building) ○ Staff/Educator Turnover Rate ○ Educator Vacancy; initial vacancies, appropriately certified, vacant all year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to general education curriculum – general education and special education classrooms • ACT: composite score, % scoring at or above the national average • ACTs PLAN Assessment: % scoring at or below the national median • Alternate programming available • Average Senior GPA • Career Interest Inventories • Career/vocational course grades • District and/or Building Assessment Scores; reading, mathematics, communication arts (Elementary, Middle, High School) • Dual Credit, number passing • MAP Scores (IEP and All by District, Building & Student) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MAP Alternate ○ Reading, Mathematics, and Communication Arts Achievement ○ By subject and grade level • PSAT: optional • SAT: Advanced Placement: number scoring 3,4 or 5 on exam • Students with disabilities access and usage of career education programs • Students with disabilities access and usage of work experience programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A+ Participation: number 9-12, number of graduates • Attendance policies • Child Complaints; number, frequency, type, resolution (Special education students) • Disciplinary Policies • Inclusion practices: least restrictive environment, access to regular education, etc. • Number of Staff Recognitions per Quarter • Number of Student Recognitions per Quarter • Professional Development: percent of staff participating in high-quality staff development during the year • Trainings pertaining to any change processes, staff and/or parents • Special Education Referrals: Number of Referrals Accepted, Number of Referrals Placed • Student Service Team (SST) Referrals Resulting in Special Education Referral, Resulting in Placement • Staff Recruitment and Retention; hiring practices, organizational dynamics, working conditions, supervisory/management techniques, support systems, training, etc. • Transition planning practices: IEP, consultation, implementation, access, opportunities, etc. • Vocational Course Offerings (HS): number of courses, number enrolled, number completing and % placed • Work experience opportunities available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints (parent, student, staff, etc.); number, frequency, type, resolution • Focus Groups • Interviews (unbiased formal and/or informal instrument) • Observations (unbiased formal and/or informal instrument) • Questionnaires/Surveys: Student, Parent, Teacher, Administrator

Special Education Improvement Plan
UNDERSTANDING BASELINE AND TARGETS
Definitions and Examples

PURPOSE: To assist districts with understanding trends, baseline data and targets in completing an improvement plan.

Definition	Example	Reference Data										
<p>Trend – the past performance of an individual or group as measured over some time period. Trend data can be used to project the future performance of an individual or group of individuals with and without the implementation of some objective.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graph 1.1 indicates the dropout rate for IEP students is increasing at a rate of 0.5% each year. The trend data for the last two years shows dropout rates of 4.8% in 2004-2005 and 5.3% in 2005-2006. 	<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Graph 1.1 Dropout Rates IEP Students</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td>2004</td> <td>2005</td> <td>2006</td> <td>2007</td> </tr> <tr> <td>■ IEP Trends & Baseline</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td>5.3%</td> <td>5.8%</td> </tr> </table> </div>		2004	2005	2006	2007	■ IEP Trends & Baseline	4.3%	4.8%	5.3%	5.8%
	2004		2005	2006	2007							
■ IEP Trends & Baseline	4.3%	4.8%	5.3%	5.8%								
<p>Baseline – Level of performance at the “start” of data collection. The baseline is a “line in the sand” that can be used to measure change of important performance indicators in the future. When baseline data is compared with data collected at later points in the educational process, decisions can be made as to whether students are making adequate progress.</p> <p>Note: Baseline is generally the most recent data available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graph 1.1 shows a baseline (2006-07) of 5.8% for IEP students as it is the most current year of dropout data available and thus the starting point for measuring future change. 											

Definition	Example	Reference Data																		
<p>Intermediate Target – Intermediate and final targets should use the same measure as the trend and baseline data, and the trend and baseline data should be used to set appropriate targets for future years. Intermediate targets are often performance levels that are expected to be achieved on the way to the final target, often with specific achievement dates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After implementation of improvement planning activities, the district projects the dropout rate will decrease by 0.5% each year as depicted by the line on Graph 2.1. Intermediate targets for the first and second years are 5.3% and 4.8% respectively. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Graph 2.1 Dropout Rates Benchmarks & Target</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td>2007</td> <td>2008</td> <td>2009</td> <td>2010</td> <td>2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP Baseline</td> <td>5.8%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP Intermediate & Final Targets</td> <td></td> <td>5.3%</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>3.8%</td> </tr> </table>		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	IEP Baseline	5.8%					IEP Intermediate & Final Targets		5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	3.8%
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011															
IEP Baseline	5.8%																			
IEP Intermediate & Final Targets		5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	3.8%															
<p>Target – Desired level of performance to be reached. A target is usually the criterion (long-term) level of desired performance. Often the target level is specified in, or can be derived from, the objective statement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on expected level of change as a result of improvement planning activities, the district projects a cumulative decrease of 2.0% over five years and sets a target of 3.8% for 2011 as shown in Graph 2.1. 																			

Based on the example used above, the following depicts the information in the ePeGs Improvement Plan. The Progress column would be filled in as actual data are compiled for each school year along with the designation of whether or not the intermediate and final targets were met.

Progress Measures

School Year	Baseline	Progress	Target	Target Met
2006-2007	5.8%	-	-	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
2007-2008	-	-	5.3%	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
2008-2009	-	-	4.8%	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
2009-2010	-	-	4.3%	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
2010-2011	-	-	3.8%	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A

Special Education Improvement planning in ePeGS

Plan Section	Plan Component	Entry Notes	Scoring Guide Elements?
Needs Assessment	Needs Assessment	There will be two needs assessment boxes. The first box will be for the overall District Needs Assessment. <i>This field is limited to 4000 characters total.</i> The second box will be labeled "Needs Assessment Supporting Documentation." This is the box in which your Special Education specific Needs Assessment needs to be entered. To get to this field select the Special Education link at the bottom of the "Needs Assessment" Page under "Supporting Documentation for Needs Assessment Additional Elements" <i>This field is limited to 16,000 characters total.</i>	Yes
Goal	Goal	5 goals + 2 optional LEA defined goals. Special education objectives are tied to a district goal	
Objectives	Objective Statement	Text entry for objective statement. <i>This field is limited to 1000 characters. See Comments section below.</i>	Yes
	MSIP Standards	Select all applicable	
	SPP Indicators	Select all applicable	Yes
	Progress Measures	Two of the Progress Measures (Baseline and Targets), are established when the objective is written. Annual targets (sometimes referred to as "Intermediate Targets" or "Benchmarks") and a long range (three to five years) target should be set. The "Progress" measures are entered at the end of each evaluation period and should be reported annually.	Yes
	Comments	Information regarding the monitoring of progress towards the objective should be entered here. <i>This field is limited to 500 characters. If you attempt to copy/paste more than 500 characters into the field, you will get an error, and no information will be saved. Statements regarding the monitoring of progress should be concise and can generally be covered by 500 characters. If you need additional space, enter it in the "Objective Statement" field.</i>	Yes
Strategies	Strategy	Text entry for strategy to be implemented. <i>This field is limited to 1000 characters. See Comments section below.</i>	Yes
	MSIP Standards	Select all applicable	
	Persons Responsible	Text entry for name and/or role	Yes
	Funding Source	Select all applicable. <i>For special education grant applications, mark "Special Education Elem. Ach." or "Special Education Sec. Trans" as appropriate. Multiple funding sources can be selected (i.e., Special Education Elem. Ach. and Special Education Part B Entitlement), but only one of the two special education grant funding sources (elementary achievement or secondary transition) may be selected per strategy</i>	
	Date to implement strategy	Date field	Yes
	Date of completion	Date field	Yes
	Apply strategy to plan	Select all applicable. <i>Must select Special Education Improvement Plan for grant and self-assessment purposes</i>	
	Comments	Include rationale for selection of the strategy and the building(s) in which the strategy will be implemented <i>This field is limited to 500 characters. If you attempt to copy/paste more than 500 characters into the field, you will get an error, and no information will be saved. Statements regarding the rationale and buildings should be concise and can generally be covered by 500 characters. If you need</i>	Yes

		<i>additional space, enter it in the "Strategy" field.</i>	
Action Steps	Action Step	Enter brief description of action step. Include: Action steps to implement the strategy Collection of measures of student progress. Indicate the specific measures and the frequency of the collection Collection of measures of fidelity of implementation. Indicate the specific measures and the frequency of the collection	Yes
	Date to Implement Action Step	Enter anticipated date to implement	Yes
	Date of completion	Enter anticipated date of completion	Yes
Budget	Budget	Entered through IMACS. <i>After submitting the plan in ePeGS (see below), log into IMACS, Click on the "Objectives and Strategies" link, then navigate through the objective and strategy levels to the budget section. Click on "Add" to enter a new budget item, select 2010-11 as the expenditure year, select the budget categories, enter a brief description and the budget amount.</i>	Yes
Print/Submit	Left Menu	In left menu, click on "Submit/Print Plan" under the Planning Tool menu. There will be a link to the Special Education Improvement Plan if you have marked that in the "Apply Strategy to Plan" section for a strategy. Make sure that all objectives/strategies that you intended to tie to the Special Education Improvement Plan are included in the Print version.	

9/2010

Missouri Improvement Plan Scoring Guide

IP Section	Scoring Guide (any items not addressed will receive 0 points)	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Needs Assessment (12 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes the stakeholder group including how all required stakeholders --administrators, parents, general education, special education and community-- are involved in the analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation process • Methodology of drilldown process and data sources used are appropriate and described in sufficient detail • Hypothesized root causes in needed areas of improvement are identified through data analysis • The needs of the district are identified and prioritized (if multiple needs are listed) through data analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder group is limited to special education personnel • Inappropriate data sources and/or unclear description of methodology or data sources • Hypothesized root causes are listed but no description of the methodology or connection between root causes not explained • Needs and priorities are not clearly stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder group does not include all role types and/or the role of stakeholders is limited • NA • Hypothesized root causes are identified, but description of the methodology is weak and the connection between root causes and the needs is not clear • Needs are stated but not prioritized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required group of stakeholders is described and is involved in all aspects of the improvement planning process • Data sources include appropriate measures. Drilldown methodology is used Data is disaggregated and findings reported in the needs assessments. • Hypothesized root causes are identified through data and systems analysis and are directly related to the needs of the district. Process is explained • Needs are stated and prioritized

IP Section	Scoring Guide (any items not addressed will receive 0 points)	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
<p>Objectives (16 points)</p> <p>Entered in comments field</p> <p>Entered in comments field</p> <p>Entered in comments field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objective is Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-oriented and Time-bound • The SPP Indicators that the objective will address are specified • Intermediate and final targets are specified and dates by which they will be achieved are specified • Evaluation procedure(s) align directly to the objective • It is clearly stated <i>when</i> reports with respect to outcomes will be made and <i>to whom</i> • Evaluation procedures for objective occur with sufficient frequency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one or two of SMART met • SPP Indicators specified • Specified targets are not relevant measures for the objective • NA • Only one of when or whom is provided • Insufficient frequency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-4 of SMART met • NA • Intermediate OR final target is specified. Target is relevant to the objective • NA • NA • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMART met • NA • Intermediate AND final targets are specified. Targets are relevant to the objective • All evaluation procedures are aligned to the objective • It is clearly stated <i>when</i> reports with respect to outcomes will be made and <i>to whom</i> • Evaluative frequency is appropriate for objective

IP Section	Scoring Guide (any items not addressed will receive 0 points)	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
<p>Strategy (13 points)</p> <p>Entered in comments field</p> <p>Entered in comments field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy is evidence based and is aligned with the objective (If strategy is not evidence based scoring will STOP at this point) • District personnel responsible for supervision of the strategy are clearly identified by role and/or name • The rationale describes how the strategy matches district prioritized needs and is linked to hypothesized root causes • The rationale describes how staff buy-in (ownership) for implementation of the strategy was achieved and at what level • Strategy includes ongoing high-quality professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA • District personnel responsible for supervision of the strategy are clearly identified by role and/or name • NA • Staff were informed of the strategy but there is no indication that staff were involved in the selection/planning, nor is the level of staff buy-in indicated • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA • NA • Strategy is linked to the district's needs but does not directly address the hypothesized root causes • Staff were informed, but the level of involvement/degree of support is limited • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy is aligned with the objective and is evidenced-based • NA • The relationship between the strategy and the needs/root causes is clearly explained • Staff were included in the selection of and planning for the strategy. A high level of staff support for implementation is evident • Professional development is high quality and ongoing

IP Section	Scoring Guide (any items not addressed will receive 0 points)	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Action Steps (13 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action steps provide a logical sequence from planning to implementation and evaluation of the strategy and are specific enough to ensure effective implementation of the strategy • The projected starting dates for the action steps are identified • Action steps include communication with and/or involvement of parents regarding implementation, progress and/or outcomes of the strategy • Action steps include a determination of whether the strategy is implemented as intended (i.e., strategy fidelity/program integrity) • Action steps include objective, quantifiable and/or qualitative data and are sufficiently sensitive to detect small increments of change in student progress (Note: Generally a minimum of three times per year would be expected; however, appropriate frequency is dependent on measure type.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited number of action steps are listed, and/or do not cover the full implementation of the strategy • Start dates are identified • NA • Collection of qualitative and/or quantitative implementation fidelity measures are included • Includes collection of broad impact measures that do not allow for detecting small increments of change in student progress. Data not collected frequently enough to allow adaptation or are unrelated to the strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps are listed, but are too broad to guide full implementation of the strategy • NA • NA • NA • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific steps are listed that will ensure full implementation and evaluation of the strategy • NA • Communication with and/or involvement of parents regarding implementation, progress and/or outcomes of the strategy are clearly stated • Collection of <i>clearly defined</i> qualitative and/or quantitative implementation fidelity measures are included • Action steps include the collection of specific quantitative and/or qualitative impact measures that can detect small increments of change in student progress

IP Section	Scoring Guide (any items not addressed will receive 0 points)	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Budget (11 points) Required only for grant districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget includes only approvable expenses • Budget expenses do not exceed the 6% cap on food* • Budget expenses do not exceed the 5% cap on incentives* • Budget is aligned with action steps • Budget is detailed enough to outline all expected costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA • Budget does not exceed food cap • Budget does not exceed incentive cap • NA • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA • NA • NA • NA • NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget includes only approvable expenses • NA • NA • Budget items are clearly tied to action steps • Budget is detailed and outlines all expected costs.

**If caps are exceeded and grant is awarded district will need to adjust budget accordingly to comply with percentage caps.



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
 PO BOX 480, JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-0480
DEPARTMENT'S GOALS ALIGNMENT RUBRIC FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS

SECTION I. PROJECT PARTICIPANT PRIORITY LEVEL STATUS

Directions: Select only one Priority Level Status per application. Only one building within a district, consortium or service area needs to be classified in the lowest level to generate the lowest possible level ranking for the district or consortium. The proposal must address an area or areas of needed improvement in the building or district that earned the designation to be awarded maximum points in this section. **The status of a building or district will be determined by the Department's annual final accountability reports.**

	Points Earned	Priority Level Description
Priority Level 1 Status (20 points possible)		Persistently Low-Achieving: Districts that qualify for Priority Level 1 Status have one or more buildings designated as a Title I, Part A, Section 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Tier I or Tier II building and/or their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APR) are at an unaccredited or provisionally accredited status.
Priority Level 2 Status (10 points possible)		Struggling With Consistency: K-12 Districts that qualify for Priority Level 2 Status have one or more buildings designated as a Title I, Part A, Section 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Tier III building and/or met fewer than 12 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs). K-8 districts that qualify for Priority Level 2 Status have one or more buildings designated as a Title I, Part A, Section 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Tier III building and/or met fewer than 6 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs).
Priority Level 3 Status (0 points possible)		Performing: K-12 Districts that qualify for Priority Level 3 Status have no designated Title I, Part A, Section 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Tier I, II, or III buildings and met greater than 11 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs). K-8 districts that qualify for Priority Level 3 Status have no designated Title I, Part A, Section 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Tier I, II, or III buildings and met greater than 5 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs).
Section I. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)		<i>Transfer total to SECTION III.</i>

SECTION II. PROJECT ALIGNMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT'S GOALS

Directions: Within the narrative of the proposal, applicants are anticipated to demonstrate alignment with the Department's Goals through one or more planned LEA actions. The reviewer must note the specific location of the LEA action for all scored items. If the reviewer finds multiple LEA actions which qualify for an awarded point, note the location of the first reference. Each LEA action can only receive a maximum of five points. The reviewer is not responsible in this section to determine the anticipated effectiveness or quality of the proposed LEA action, only to identify its inclusion in the application. A "No" designation scores zero points for that LEA action.

Application Location of LEA Action	Demonstrated Alignment	Points Earned	Goal
Yes = 5 points			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Missouri students will rank in the top 10 on national and international assessments of student performance.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Missouri will provide high quality early childhood educational opportunities, including voluntary PreK, to all young children and their families.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Missouri will recruit, prepare, retain and support effective teachers and leaders.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will improve departmental efficiency, operational effectiveness and relations with internal and external constituents.

SECTION III. POINT TOTALS

Section I. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)	
Section II. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)	
GRAND TOTAL POINTS EARNED (40 points possible)	