CLUSTER: FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (FAPE IN THE LRE)

OBJECTIVE: All children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment that promotes a high quality education and prepares them for employment and independent living.

RELATED MISSOURI PERFORMANCE GOAL(S):
The percentage of students with disabilities in Grades 3 and 7 who are proficient readers will increase, while the percentage that have the Missouri Assessment Program – Communication Arts (MAP-CA) read to them will decrease.

The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at the Step 1 and Progressing achievement levels will decrease, while the percentage of students with disabilities scoring at Proficient and Advanced will increase for each of the MAP subject area assessments.

The percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma will increase.

The percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school will decrease.

Notes:

- Components and indicators marked with an "*" are included in Cluster Lite.
- Related professional development is listed under the indicators. For descriptions of the professional development, please refer to the Comprehensive System of Professional Development section.
- General notes about the data analyzed in this report can be found in the Data Explanations section.

Component BF.1*: Are the needs of children with disabilities determined based on information from an appropriate evaluation?

Overview Answer: Based on the data available at this time no conclusion can be drawn with respect to determining if individuals conducting the evaluations have received appropriate training and in-service. The data from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) regarding individuals that conduct evaluations is limited to ancillary personnel, which doesn't give the full picture. It is assumed that if an individual is certificated in the area of special education, then they are qualified to conduct and interpret educational assessments.

Strengths: Missouri's overall incidence rate is comparable with national averages. The new monitoring process will enable the state to identify district concerns related to the evaluation and identification process (initial eligibility identification, information provided by parents, timelines and procedural safeguards).

DESE has a leadership role in providing technical assistance for school district teams to improve Individualized Education Plans (IEP) decision-making and development of goals, objectives and benchmarks. Related professional development is identified for each indicator. From the lists, it is obvious that Missouri has a strong Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD).

Areas of Concern: Incidence rates for Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech/Language Impairments and Other Health Impairments are higher than the national averages. African Americans are disproportionately over-identified in the following disability categories: Emotional Disturbance, Mental Retardation and Specific Learning Disabilities. African Americans are also over-represented in self-contained settings.

Other Comments: Data is needed to address the issue of available personnel by regions of the state. Some regions may have a lack of available personnel that are not represented in the total figures for the state.

There is a need to include standards in the monitoring process that address connections between evaluation, present level of performance, goals and services for children with disabilities. The Compliance section will investigate implementation of monitoring procedures, which would include this type of in-depth analysis of individual student files.

The committee recommends that DESE review and improve the system for the identification of personnel who are qualified to teach students with disabilities. In addition, there is a need to know the categories of disability that teachers are serving through direct services or through consultation with general educators. DESE needs to identify what teacher data is needed to answer these questions and accurately represent the job functions that teachers are performing.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.1.1*: Is the percentage of children with disabilities receiving special education, as identified by state eligibility criteria, comparable to national data?

Data Sources:

- Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Related CSPD:

- Autism – Project Access
- Quality Eligibility Decisions
- Traumatic Brain Injury

Data Summary:

Percentage (Based on Estimated Resident Population) of Children Served under IDEA, Part B

	1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001	
Ages	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21
Missouri	4.34	9.55	4.85	9.71	5.04	9.65
50 States and DC	4.88	8.82	5.05	8.92	5.04	8.75

Source: Annual Report to Congress

Percentage (Based on Estimated Resident Population) of Children Served under IDEA, Part B, by Disability Category for the 2000-2001 School Year

	Missouri	50 States and DC
All Disabilities	9.65	8.75
Specific Learning Disabilities	5.04	4.37
Speech or Language Impairments	2.00	1.66
Mental Retardation	0.95	0.92
Emotional Disturbance	0.70	0.72
Multiple Disabilities	0.07	0.19
Hearing Impairments	0.09	0.11
Orthopedic Impairments	0.05	0.11
Other Health Impairments	0.57	0.44
Visual Impairments	0.03	0.04
Autism	0.12	0.12
Deaf-Blindness	0.00	0.00
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.03	0.02
Developmental Delay	0.00	0.04

Source: Annual Report to Congress

Committee Conclusions:
Missouri's overall incidence rates for both 6-21 and 3-5 are comparable to the national averages for the FY1999, FY2000 and FY2001 school years as defined by a "P + 20% of P" criteria.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.1.1*: Concluded	The categories of specific learning disability, speech/language impairment, other health impaired and traumatic brain injury are higher than the national average for the FY2001 school year, based on the range produced by a "P+10% of P" analysis.
BF.1.2 (a): Does the State have sufficient personnel qualified to conduct and interpret required evaluation? **BF.1.2 (b):** Are evaluation personnel available to conduct evaluation? **Data Sources:** • Monitoring data **Related CSPD:** • Autism – Project Access • New Scripts Early Intervention/Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation • Quality Eligibility Decisions • Traumatic Brain Injury	**Data Summary:** **Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator B 101300** – Eligibility staffing held within required timelines for initial evaluations: 17 of 94, 18.09 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator B 103900** – Eligibility staffing held within required timelines for reevaluations: 16 of 92, 17.39 percent of agencies noncompliant **Committee Conclusions (for 2a):** Missouri's system for collecting data on individuals qualified to conduct evaluations does not accurately reflect the actual number of individuals in the state engaging in evaluation activities. That information is necessary to determine if there are sufficient personnel in the state. **Committee Conclusions (for 2b):** Monitoring data shows that there are districts out of compliance with evaluation/reevaluation timelines. It is not known that this is due to lack of sufficient qualified personnel, but that is one conclusion that could be drawn. Further analysis of these monitoring standards is needed in order to determine why districts were found out of compliance. Missouri's current data addressing personnel available to conduct evaluations is limited to ancillary personnel reported on Core Data. This does not consider other special education staff that may conduct evaluations as an additional assignment to their teaching position. No data is collected that represents the number of individuals conducting evaluations through contract arrangements with the local district (e.g., OT, PT, Vision, etc.). Notes: • Ancillary personnel is defined as professional personnel who provide special education support services other than those provided by a teacher (i.e., special education administrators, diagnosticians, psychological examiners, etc.). • The committee was unable to reach consensus on the issue of defining "qualified personnel." Missouri's current data reflects numbers of teachers and ancillary personnel reported by districts on Core Data and represents individuals who hold Missouri Teacher Certification. Some members of the committee expressed concern that just using teacher certification as a benchmark for measuring qualified personnel would not adequately address the issue. There is a need to ensure that those individuals conducting evaluations are appropriately trained and knowledgeable in the area(s) they are assessing. The mere fact that they hold a state teaching credential was not considered sufficient by some committee members to equate to "qualified" personnel.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.1.3*: Is the percentage of children with disabilities disaggregated by race/ethnicity in each disability category comparable to the general population of the state?

Data Sources

- State 618 data

Related CSPD:

- Autism – Project Access
- Leadership Series – Data
- Traumatic Brain Injury

Data Summary:

Disability by Race
2001-2002 School Year

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Mental Retardation	65.8%	**32.1%**	*1.3%*	*0.5%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Emotional Disturbance	67.9%	**30.9%**	*0.7%*	*0.2%*	0.2%	100.0%
Speech/Language Impairment	85.7%	*12.1%*	*1.3%*	*0.6%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Orthopedic Impairment	79.5%	16.9%	2.0%	1.4%	*0.2%*	100.0%
Partial Sight	82.1%	*13.5%*	**3.1%**	*0.9%*	**0.4%**	100.0%
Blindness	78.7%	17.3%	**2.9%**	*0.7%*	**0.4%**	100.0%
Hearing Impairment	82.8%	14.1%	1.7%	1.0%	**0.4%**	100.0%
Deafness	75.2%	19.4%	**3.2%**	**1.9%**	*0.2%*	100.0%
Specific Learning Disabilities	76.4%	**21.6%**	*1.4%*	*0.3%*	0.3%	100.0%
Other Health Impairment	85.3%	*13.4%*	*0.7%*	*0.4%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Deaf/Blindness	67.6%	**32.4%**	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	100.0%
Multiple Disabilities	78.4%	18.4%	*1.3%*	1.0%	**0.9%**	100.0%
Autism	80.6%	16.3%	*1.5%*	**1.4%**	*0.2%*	100.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	77.7%	19.3%	*1.4%*	1.1%	**0.6%**	100.0%
Young Child w/ Dev. Delay	82.3%	15.2%	*1.5%*	*0.9%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Total Student Population	79.0%	17.5%	2.0%	1.2%	0.3%	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in bold (left) indicate over-representation according to the "P + 20% of P" criteria.
Percentages in italics (right) indicate under-representation according to the "P - 20% of P" criteria.

Committee Conclusions:
Using a “P +/- 20% of P” criteria as used in Missouri’s Biennial Performance Report to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), several categories of race by disability show up as over- or under-represented. The most significant areas of concern are seen in the over-representation of African American students with the disability diagnoses of Mental Retardation, Emotional Disturbance and Specific Learning Disabilities. Many other areas of over- or under-representation are seen, but are not considered significant due to the low number of students in the disability categories and/or racial/ethnic groups. These results are consistent with the two previous years’ data with the exception of Specific Learning Disabilities, which is significant in some years and not in others.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.1.3*: Concluded	At this time, the Division of Special Education is working to determine the best way to address this issue. Disproportionality is now looked at as a part of the Monitoring Screening process and districts that appear to have issues with disproportionality will be more likely to receive an on-site monitoring visit. During the Spring of 2003, the Division will conduct workshops for school districts that will present information on the use of data and compliance information in the management of the special education process in order to impact outcome for students with disabilities. An analysis of disproportionality data will be one of the topics covered.

BF.1.4: Do local educational agencies (LEAs) comply with monitoring standards for evaluations?

Data Sources:

- Monitoring data

Related CSPD:

- Autism – Project Access
- Leadership Series – Compliance, Compliance and Data
- Third cycle Monitoring
- Traumatic Brain Injury

Data Summary:

Monitoring Data

FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Evaluation-1** – Children with disabilities receive evaluations in all areas related to a suspected disability. The evaluation information addresses educational needs, including progress in the general curriculum (or age-appropriate activities for preschool children): not monitored in FY2002

FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Evaluation-3** – Evaluations are appropriately administered, including evaluations for transitioning from Part C, if applicable: 42 of 94, 31.91 percent of agencies noncompliant

FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Evaluation-5** – Eligibility criteria are applied appropriately for all initial evaluations: 3 of 48, 6.25 percent of agencies noncompliant

Monitoring Indicator 103100/103200 – Initial eligibility determination or reevaluation determination of continuing eligibility

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	Unknown*	4	Incomplete	
FY2000	Unknown	8	Incomplete	
FY2001	Unknown	8	Incomplete	

* This information could not be queried from the database.

Monitoring Indicator 102110 – Procedural safeguards at referral

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	87	26	8	0
FY2000	106	37	3	Incomplete
FY2001	104	41	Incomplete	

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.1.4: Continued	

Monitoring Indicator 102120 – Information provided by the parent

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	87	15	8	0
FY2000	106	20	1	Incomplete
FY2001	104	12	Incomplete	

Monitoring Indicator 102130 – Eligibility team includes parent

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	87	9	1	0
FY2000	106	14	2	Incomplete
FY2001	104	10	Incomplete	

Monitoring Indicator 102140 – Copy of report given to parent

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	88	34	8	0
FY2000	106	51	2	Incomplete
FY2001	104	44	Incomplete	

Monitoring Indicator 102150 – Notice within 30 days of referral

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	89	1	1	0
FY2000	106	13	0	
FY2001	104	18	Incomplete	

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.1.4: Concluded	Monitoring Indicator 102160 – Staffing within 45 days of consent

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	89	3	2	0
FY2000	106	8	1	Incomplete
FY2001	104	10	Incomplete	

Monitoring Indicator 102170 – IEP within 30 days of eligibility staffing

	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2
FY1999	88	3	0	0
FY2000	106	3	0	
FY2001	104	4	Incomplete	

Committee Conclusions:
Monitoring data indicates that many districts are out of compliance on evaluation standards/indicators at the initial review, however, most districts are in compliance by the time of the first follow-up. A more detailed analysis of the monitoring data is needed to determine the causes for the noncompliance. Current data reflecting the findings from monitoring activities with Missouri public agencies is not sufficient to draw conclusions about statewide compliance with all standards related to evaluations, since all standards related to evaluation have not been monitored. Monitoring data should be an important factor for future decisions on this issue.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.1.5: Do the needs of children with disabilities as identified in the evaluation report and present level of performance appear in the individualized education program (IEP) as goals or services? **Data Sources:** • Monitoring data **Related CSPD:** • Assistive Technology • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks • New Scripts Early Intervention/Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation • Quality Eligibility Decisions	**Data Summary:** Data specific to this issue was not available. **Committee Conclusions:** Information that would enable the state to draw conclusions on this issue was not part of Missouri's monitoring focus during the second Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) cycle and therefore, no data was available to make a judgment on the question.

Component BF.2: Are special education and related services available to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities?

Overview Answer: Many factors shed light in this area, but do not fully answer the question. Additional analysis is needed. Teacher certification data shows that the percent of teachers not fully certified has increased over the past three years for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education programs. Data shows that caseloads are within acceptable ranges. There are no data available on contracted related services providers.

Strengths: The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is proactive in providing tuition reimbursement for teachers currently certified in regular education to pursue certification in special education. DESE also provides tuition reimbursement to paraprofessionals who have sixty college hours and have worked in a special education classroom for two years. Many types of professional development are available for educators in the state.

Areas of Concern: There are shortages of special education teachers. The strategy to increase the number of available teachers may result in a different standard for certification of teachers. As an example, regular education teachers are now allowed to take a test (Praxis) and receive a Missouri certificate to teach special education (cross-categorical mild to moderate). This will result in there being more special education certified teachers, but those teachers may not have the educational background and expertise to work with students with disabilities.

Other Comments: Teacher certification information is not available by specific disability category. There is also no data on teacher assignments and the appropriateness of those assignments in relationship to teachers' knowledge and expertise. The number of teachers in the Department of Corrections (DOC) needs to be collected in order to calculate accurate ratios. DESE will begin to collect the DOC's data through the same procedures used by all other school districts. The number of contracted special education service providers needs to be collected. Data needs to be analyzed on a regional basis so that all areas of the state can be evaluated regarding the availability of qualified staff to meet the needs of children with disabilities.

The committee was unable to reach consensus on the issue of defining "qualified personnel." Missouri's current data reflects numbers of teachers and ancillary personnel reported by districts on Core Data and represent individuals who hold Missouri Teacher Certification. Some members of the committee expressed concern that just using teacher certification as a benchmark for measuring qualified personnel would not adequately address the issue. There is a need to ensure that those individuals conducting evaluations are appropriately trained and knowledgable in the area(s) they are assessing. The mere fact that they hold a state teaching credential was not considered sufficient by some committee members to equate to "qualified" personnel.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.2.1: Are there sufficient numbers of qualified teachers and related service providers to meet the identified needs of all children with disabilities?

Data Sources:

- State 618 data

Related CSPD:

- Mentoring for Success of Students with Disabilities (Grants and Manual) Resource Document
- Missouri Teacher Certification Requirements
- Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP)
- New Scripts Early Intervention/Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation
- Orientation and Mobility Certification
- School Psychologist Intern Project
- Tuition Reimbursement

Data Summary:

Student/Teacher Ratios

School-Age			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
1998-1999	8,413.84	124,606	14.81
1999-2000	8,723.99	127,225	14.58
2000-2001	8,696.64	129,347	14.87

Early Childhood Special Education			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
1998-1999	623.46	6,965	11.17
1999-2000	646.34	7,725	11.95
2000-2001	552.63	8,036	14.54

Sources:

1. OSEP Table 2 - Personnel, Total FTE Employed, for Ages 6-21
2. State Profile Table 1, for Ages 5K-21+
3. OSEP Table 2 - Personnel, Total FTE Employed, for Ages 3-5
4. State Profile Table 1, for Early Childhood, Ages 3-6 (non-K)

Teacher Certification Data

School-Age - Ages 6-21				
Year	Employed Fully Certified*	Employed Not Fully Certified	Total Employed	Percent Not Fully Certified
1998-1999	7,911.26	502.58	8,413.84	6.0%
1999-2000	8,115.89	608.10	8,723.99	7.0%
2000-2001	8,077.31	619.33	8,696.64	7.1%

Early Childhood Special Education - Ages 3-5				
Year	Employed Fully Certified*	Employed Not Fully Certified	Total Employed	Percent Not Fully Certified
1998-1999	530.46	93.00	623.46	14.9%
1999-2000	550.34	96.00	646.34	14.9%
2000-2001	462.51	90.12	552.63	16.3%

Source: OSEP Table 2 - Personnel, Total FTE Employed

** “Fully Certified” includes PCI, PCII, CPC and Life Certificates

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.2.1: Concluded	**Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator 108800** – Special education and related services are provided in accordance with the individualized education program (IEP): 14 of 93, 15.05 percent of agencies noncompliant **Committee Conclusions:** Teacher certification data shows that the percent of teachers not fully certified has increased over the past three years for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education programs. Data shows that caseloads are within acceptable ranges. Missouri has no available data on contracted related services providers and this information, if available, would impact the answer to this question. The existing data does not include information by specific disability categories and the available teachers based on teacher certification in those specific areas. Regional analysis of the data would be helpful. Calculating a student-teacher ratio on a statewide basis would not provide an accurate picture for the state since it would not accurately reflect the situation in some regions of the state where the availability of qualified staff to work with children with disabilities is limited. Data regarding the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) child count and the numbers of ECSE teachers was easier to evaluate during this process. A student-teacher ratio may be more accurate for this population of children.

Component BF.3*: Are appropriate special education and related services provided to children with disabilities served by the public agency?

Overview Answer: This component was answered by looking at performance and exiting data for students with disabilities. The assumption is that if students are provided with appropriate services, then positive outcomes and increased performance will follow. In Missouri, there has been an increase in graduation rates and a decrease in the dropout rates for students with disabilities. Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data shows progress in the performance of students with disabilities. There has also been an increase in the percent of students with disabilities placed in regular education settings.

Strengths: The new Missouri monitoring system holds districts accountable for specific performance standards, including graduation rates, dropout rates, Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) results, etc. Districts found to have performance issues must incorporate improvement plans into their Annual Program Review and Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP).

Areas of Concern: While there has been an improvement in statewide graduation and dropout rates and MAP performance for students with disabilities, there are still significant gaps between students with disabilities and all students, and many districts are not seeing improved performance. There are also significant differences found when data are disaggregated by disability. For example, the dropout rate is much higher for students with emotional disturbances, mental retardation and/or specific learning disabilities.

Other Comments: Students receiving services through the Department of Corrections (DOC), Division of Youth Services (DYS), State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH), Missouri School for the Blind (MSB) and Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) are not consistently included in the exiting data. This is done for a variety of reasons, including:

- Data for some of the programs is not reported/included in the comparable data for all students
- Exiting data reported by DOC and DYS would artificially increase the statewide dropout rate since students in those facilities receive a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) rather than a diploma upon successful completion of the educational program. In Missouri, GED recipients are included in the dropout numbers.

DESE's current system of collecting exiting data makes it difficult to compare children with disabilities with non-disabled children. In this report, data for all students includes students with disabilities in the totals.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.3.1*: Are high school completion rates for children with disabilities comparable to completion rates for non-disabled children?

Data Sources:
- Graduation data
- Monitoring data

Related CSPD:
- Eduequity
- Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin
- Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)
- Network for High Schools with Results
- Secondary Transition

Data Summary:

Graduation Rate Summary

	Students with Disabilities*		All Students
Year	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate
2000-2001	4,605	59.5%	81.4%
1999-2000	4,451	53.4%	80.3%
1998-1999	3,966	53.1%	78.5%

* Excludes Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services, Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped

Notes: "All Student" data from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) web site. Graduation rate formula: Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates).
"Students with Disabilities" data from Screen 12 of core Data as of June 5, 2002. Graduation rate formula: Graduates with a diploma / (Graduates with a diploma + Dropouts).

Monitoring Data

FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Secondary Transition-3** – The percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma will increase: 19 of 87, 21.84 percent of agencies noncompliant

Committee Conclusions:
The graduation rates of students with disabilities are significantly lower than that of all students for each of the reported years, however the gap decreased for the 2000-2001 school year. Many districts are not meeting the standard for increasing graduation rates indicating that much work is still needed in this area despite the fact that there are many opportunities for professional development in the state.

BF.3.2*: Are dropout rates for children with disabilities comparable to those for children without disabilities?

Data sources:
- Dropout data
- Monitoring data

Data Summary:

Dropout Rate Summary

	Students with Disabilities*		All Students
Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate	Dropout Rate
2000-2001	3,138	7.6%	4.5%
1999-2000	3,880	9.6%	4.3%
1998-1999	3,504	9.1%	4.7%

* Excludes Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services, Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.3.2*: Concluded **Related CSPD:** • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP) • Secondary Transition	Notes: "All Student" data from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) web site. Dropout rate formula: 9-12 Dropouts / 9-12 Average Enrollment. "Students with Disabilities" data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of June 5, 2002. Dropout rate formula: Dropouts / Child Count (14-22 years). "Dropouts" for students with disabilities include students who received a certificate; reached maximum age; moved, and are not known to be continuing; and dropped out. **Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Dropouts-1** – Dropout rates for children with disabilities decrease and are no higher than those of children without disabilities: 35 of 89 39.33 percent of agencies noncompliant **Committee Conclusions:** The dropout rate of youth with disabilities is significantly higher that of all students for each of the last three years, however the gap decreased significantly in the 2000-2001 school year. While statewide dropout rates are decreasing, there are many districts that are not improving in this area. Students with Emotional Disturbance and Mental Retardation account for slightly more than 30 percent of the students with disabilities who drop out of school. In comparison, these two groups only account for slightly more than 20 percent of the special education child count for ages 14-22. Additional analysis should look at the dropout categories in order to better define the problem and to help target technical assistance.
BF.3.3*: Do children with disabilities participate and progress in the general curriculum? **Data Sources:** • State 618 data • Annual Report to Congress • Monitoring data	**Data Summary:** **Placements in Regular Classes (Outside Regular Classes < 21%)** **Ages 5K-22** Regular Class Placements Year / Number / Percent 1998-1999 / 63,712 / 51.13% 1999-2000 / 66,673 / 52.41% 2000-2001 / 69,342 / 53.61% 2001-2002 / 72,563 / 54.76% **Percent of Children Age 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments under IDEA, Part B During the 1999-2000 School Year** All Disabilities / Missouri / Outside Regular Class <21% 51.93 / Outside Regular Class 21-60% 31.62 / Outside Regular Class >60% 13.14 All Disabilities / US / 47.32 / 28.32 / 20.29

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.3.3*: Continued **Related CSPD:** • Access to the General Education Curriculum – Problem Solving for General Education Intervention • Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment • Autism – Project Access • Blind Skills Specialists • Center for Innovations in Education • Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Show Me How Technical Assistance Bulletins • Effective Practices Technical Assistance Bulletin • English Language Learners (ELL) with Special Needs • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • Leadership Series – Visually Impaired Level II • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks	**Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Special Education and Related Services-6** – Children with disabilities are provided supplementary aids and services, accommodations and modifications to support success in regular education settings: 32 of 93, 34.41 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator B 107030** – Demonstrate involvement in general curriculum: 4 of 92, 4.35 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator B 105300** – Child's regular education teacher(s) involved in individualized education program (IEP): 13 of 94, 13.83 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring **Indicator NR 405001** – Regular and special educators collaborate at all levels to help children with disabilities receive appropriate services and progress in the general curriculum: 2 of 89, 2.25 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Least Restrictive Environment-3** – The percentage of children with disabilities in each disability category, served at each point of the continuum, is comparable to statewide data: not monitored in FY02 FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Least Restrictive Environment-4** – Placement options along the continuum are made available to the extent necessary to implement each child's IEP, including community-based options for preschool children: 23 of 100, 23.00 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Least Restrictive Environment-5** – Children with disabilities participate with non-disabled children in the full range of programs and services available in the district: 13 of 94, 13.83 percent of agencies noncompliant FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Least Restrictive Environment-6** – Related services are provided in a variety of settings, including the regular classroom, where appropriate: 15 of 78, 19.23 percent of agencies noncompliant **Performance Data –** see BF.5.2

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.3.3*: Concluded **Related CSPD:** Concluded • Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A), Teaching Resource Guide • Missouri Math Initiative • Missouri Reading Initiative • Network for High Schools with Results • Parents as Teachers: Supporting Families of Children with Special Needs Guide and Training • Positive Behavior Supports • Practical Parenting Partnerships • Quality Eligibility Decisions • School Psychologist Intern Project • Secondary Transition • Traumatic Brain Injury	**Committee Conclusions:** Placement data shows that the percentage of children with disabilities in regular education placements has increased over the past three years and that Missouri's percentage in regular placements is higher than the national average. Monitoring data shows several areas of concern. Further analysis is required to determine if the noncompliance is a result of serious systemic issues that will need to be addressed or if it is a result of errors that are easily remedied such as documentation omissions. Progress data as measured by the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) performance is reported under Indicator BF.5.2. Data shows that the performance of students with disabilities is increasing overall. At this time, performance data cannot be disaggregated by placement, which would be necessary in order to compare the progress of students in regular placement to the progress of students in less inclusive settings. Other factors that could provide information on this issue could include individualized education programs (IEPs), quarterly reports to parents, retention, other standardized testing and three-year reevaluations.
BF.3.4*: Are children who would typically be identified as being eligible for special education at age 8 or older (e.g., third grade) and who are experiencing early reading or behavior difficulties, identified and receiving services earlier, to avoid falling behind peers? **Data Sources:** • State 618 data	**Data Summary:** **Percentages of Child Count by Age Groups** All Students with Disabilities

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
ECSE	5.1%	5.3%	5.7%	5.8%	6.4%
5K-7	12.9%	12.6%	12.4%	12.6%	12.4%
8-10	26.3%	26.3%	25.6%	25.0%	23.9%
11-22	55.7%	55.8%	56.3%	56.6%	57.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.3.4*: Concluded	

Specific Learning Disabilities

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
ECSE*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5K-7	4.1%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.3%
8-10	24.1%	23.8%	22.7%	21.7%	20.4%
11-22	71.8%	72.4%	73.5%	74.5%	76.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Emotional Disturbance

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
ECSE*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5K-7	7.3%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.4%
8-10	21.3%	21.1%	21.3%	22.2%	21.5%
11-22	71.4%	71.3%	71.3%	70.8%	72.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Children in early childhood programs could not have a categorical diagnosis prior to the 2001-2002 school year.

Committee Conclusions:
Data does not indicate that there is a movement towards earlier identification of children. Total child count percentages by age group show that there has been little change over the last five years, except that the percentage in Early Childhood Special Education programs has increased. Percentages for Specific Learning Disabilities have shown the largest amount of change in that percentages at the younger ages have declined while the older ages have increased. Further analysis is needed to better answer this indicator.

Component BF.4*: Are appropriate services provided to children with disabilities whose behavior impedes learning?

Overview Answer: FY02 monitoring data suggests that additional work is needed to both analyze the data and to provide better services to children with disabilities whose behavior impedes learning.

Strengths: Professional development is available on Positive Behavioral Supports. A new data collection, first used in the 2000-2001 school year, provides detailed information on the incidents requiring disciplinary action. A second year of data has now been collected and the discipline data is being included in the Special Education District Profiles and will be used for monitoring purposes. The state has a pilot program via the Department of Mental Health (DMH) to improve services and collect information about services provided to children with severe emotional disturbances.

Areas of Concern: Documentation on wrap-around services is not required in individualized educational programs (IEPs). There are wrap-around services available in some areas of the state, however the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) does not collect these data. Data is not collected in classrooms where students with behavioral needs are being instructed by a partnership between mental health professionals and special educators.

Other Comments: Data or further analysis is needed to address the following:

- IEPs with positive behavior intervention plans, when appropriate
- IEPs with crisis plans, when appropriate
- IEPs that address positive behavior interventions for students suspended or expelled
- Statewide training on positive behavior intervention for educators
- Classrooms that provide academic and therapeutic services in a joint environment
- Wrap-around services for students with disabilities exhibiting behavioral needs
- Number of districts that are members of and actively participate in local systems of care boards (e.g., CASSP, 503 boards, or other interagency treatment planning boards which include Division of Family Services (DFS), Juvenile and Family Courts, Division of Youth Services (DYS), parent representatives, community mental health services and other public or non-profit service providers)
- Number of districts that engage in a system of community involvement for wrap-around services
- Examine interagency agreements that support wrap-around services.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.4.1*: Are suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities comparable to those for children without disabilities?

Data Sources:

- Discipline incident reporting
- Biennial Performance Report

Related CSPD:

- Effective Practices Technical Assistance Bulletin
- Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin
- Positive Behavior Supports
- School Psychologist Intern Project

Data Summary:

Discipline Incidents by Disability Category
2000-2001 School Year

Disability Category	Number of Discipline Incidents	Percent of All Incidents	Percent of Incidents for Disabled	Special Education Child Count	Percent of Child Count
NON-DISABLED	2,991	67.5%			
Mental Retardation	58	1.3%	4.0%	12,563	9.1%
Emotional Disturbance	**368**	**8.3%**	**25.5%**	**9,229**	**6.7%**
Speech/Language Impaired	36	0.8%	2.5%	28,469	20.7%
Physically Impaired	-	0.0%	0.0%	705	0.5%
Partially Seeing	-	0.0%	0.0%	196	0.1%
Blind	2	0.0%	0.1%	245	0.2%
Hard of Hearing	3	0.1%	0.2%	782	0.6%
Deaf	-	0.0%	0.0%	440	0.3%
Learning Disabilities	**819**	**18.5%**	**56.8%**	**66,071**	**48.1%**
Other Health Impaired	**131**	**3.0%**	**9.1%**	**7,617**	**5.5%**
Deaf-Blind	-	0.0%	0.0%	50	0.0%
Multidisabled	13	0.3%	0.9%	916	0.7%
Autism	9	0.2%	0.6%	1,723	1.3%
Traumatic Brain Injury	1	0.0%	0.1%	341	0.2%
Early Childhood Special Ed.	1	0.0%	0.1%	8,036	5.8%
Total for Students with Disabilities	1,441	32.5%	100.0%	137,383	100.0%
Total for All Students	4,432	100.0%			

NOTE: Data includes only suspensions and expulsions resulting in more than 10 days out of school consecutively or cumulatively.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.4.1*: Concluded	**Committee Conclusions:** The table above indicates that approximately 33 percent of discipline incidents are committed by students with disabilities. Compared to Missouri's special education incidence rate of approximately 15 percent, this suggests that a disproportionate number of incidents are committed by students with disabilities. In addition, the data suggests that a disproportionate number of incidents are committed by students with emotional disturbances, learning disabilities or other health impairments. This indicator alone is not sufficient to address the component as stated above. The committee recommends an additional indicator (see below BF.4.2).
BF.4.2: Do children with disabilities have access to wrap-around services? **Data Sources:** • None **Related CSPD:** • Positive Behavior Supports • School Psychologist Intern Project	**Data Summary:** No data to address this question was available for this committee to review. **Committee Conclusions:** The committee believes that addressing this question would provide meaningful information for statewide planning on the issue of behavioral needs of children with disabilities. The committee recommends looking at a system of joint services through mental health professionals and educators as a method of providing the appropriate support services to address the mental health needs of specific children while providing an educational program.

Component BF.5*: Is continuous progress made by children with disabilities within the state's system for educational accountability?

Overview Answer: Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data indicates that some progress is being made in the performance of students with disabilities and the gap between disabled and all students is narrowing.
Strengths: Missouri has taken a pro-active approach to addressing the participation and performance of students with disabilities on the MAP. The new Missouri monitoring system has begun to hold districts accountable for specific performance indicators, including MAP results. Districts have to inform the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) how they intend to improve the performance results for the students with disabilities enrolled in their district. Missouri now has more data available to analyze performance of students with disabilities.
Areas of Concern: While the gap may be closing, students with disabilities are still scoring significantly below all students. In addition, the majority of students with disabilities are scoring at the bottom two achievement levels of the assessment (Step 1 and Progressing).
Other Comments: A longitudinal study of MAP data would be very informative, however students do not necessarily use unique identification numbers that can be tracked from year to year. DESE should investigate the inclusion of all public agencies (Department of Corrections (DOC), Division of Youth Services (DYS) and Department of Mental Health (DMH) facilities) with regard to MAP assessment and accountability measures.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.5.1*: Do children with disabilities participate in state/district-wide general assessment programs with appropriate test modifications and accommodations, as needed, across districts and comparable to national data?
 	
Data Sources:
• Biennial Performance Report
• Monitoring data
 	
Related CSPD:
• Accelerated Schools
• Access to the General Education Curriculum
• Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment
• Assistive Technology
• Center for Innovations in Education
• Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin
	Data Summary:
	The following is excerpted from Missouri's Biennial Performance Report, Table 1A, Overarching Questions for Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services
	
	1. At the grade or age levels tested, how many students with disabilities participated in the general assessment for the school year reported? 70,677 representing the sum of the maximum "Reportable" numbers for each grade level
	2. At the grade or age levels tested, how many students participated in the alternate assessment for the school year reported? 536 representing the number of Missouri Assessment Program–Alternate (MAP-A) Portfolios received
	3. At the grade or age levels tested, how many students were provided accommodations or modifications in either assessment measure? 50,842 - The test accommodations are made up of three main types: approximately 30 percent are Oral Reading of Assessment, 30 percent are Testing with Small Group and 25 percent are Extended Time or Extra Testing Sessions
	4. Do the totals shown for questions 1 and 2 include all students who were provided accommodations or modifications in the assessment? Yes
	5. At the grade or age levels tested, did ALL students with disabilities participate in at least one assessment measure? No, 3,050 did not participate as determined by "Level Not Determined" less MAP-Alternate Portfolios received
	6. What is the state's plan for including the participation of these students in future assessments? "Accountable" refers to the number of students in a given grade level that are to be tested. "Reportable" refers to the number of test booklets that were received and from which a valid score could be determined. "Level Not Determined" is the difference between Accountable and Reportable and includes any students who are eligible to take the MAP-Alternate exam. The number shown here is "Level Not Determined" less the number of MAP-Alternate portfolios received. A breakdown of the reasons that students are in "Level Not Determined" follows (Note: A student could be eligible to take two exams in a certain grade level – i.e. third grade Communication Arts and Science. A student could fall into "Level Not Determined" for neither, one or both exams. The following breakdowns are based on the reasons that a test result is "Level Not Determined", not the number of students who receive one or more results of "Level Not Determined".)
	  o Less than half a percent – Students exempt from testing due to Limited English Proficiency who have been living in the state for less than one year
	  o 25-30 percent - Students eligible to take the MAP-Alternate exam. Guidelines for the MAP-Alternate state that students should take the MAP-Alternate at ages 9, 13 and 17, therefore not all students listed as MAP-Alternate eligible would actually submit a portfolio.
	  o 35-40 percent - Students absent for one or more of the testing sessions
	  o 25-30 percent - No valid attempt for one or more of the testing sessions
	  o 2-5 percent - Exam was invalidated by the teacher (cheating, etc.)

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.5.1*: Concluded	Future monitoring activities will look into "Level Not Determined" numbers at the district level. The Division will also be comparing the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) numbers to other data sources in order to verify that all students with disabilities are being tested. **Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring Standard **State and District-wide Assessment-5** – Participation in general state assessments are comparable to statewide data: not monitored in FY02 FY2002 Monitoring Standard **State and District-wide Assessment-9** – Modifications and accommodations for general state and district-wide assessments are provided, as determined appropriate on the individualized education program (IEP): 13 of 94, 13.83 percent of agencies noncompliant **Committee Conclusions:** According to the information above, slightly more than 4 percent of special education students are not participating in the statewide MAP testing. The primary reasons for not participating were that the student was absent or that the IEP team had decided that the student should take the MAP-Alternate but the student did not participate in the MAP-Alternate that particular year. Other data (not provided in this report) shows that participation rates have improved since the first mandatory years of MAP testing. Approximately 72 percent of students with disabilities received modifications and/or accommodations on the MAP assessments. The test accommodations are made up of three main types: approximately 30 percent are Oral Reading of Assessment, 30 percent are Testing with Small Group and 25 percent are Extended Time or Extra Testing Sessions. Since the MAP exams are used only in Missouri, we do not have national data for comparison purposes. The May 2002 OSEP Biennial Performance Report gathered information from all states on participation rates. This summary data for National Comparisons is not available at this time.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.5.2*: Do performance results for children with disabilities on large-scale assessments improve at a rate that decreases any gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers?

Data Sources:

- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data

Related CSPD:

- Accelerated Schools
- Access to the General Education Curriculum
- Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment
- Center for Innovations in Education
- Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin
- Priority Schools

Data Summary:

MAP Performance for Disabled and Non-Disabled Students

Content Area	Grade Level	Year	Index for IEP Students	Index for Non-IEP Students	Gap
Communication Arts	03	1999	162.5	199.0	36.5
Communication Arts	03	2000	167.0	201.9	34.9
Communication Arts	03	2001	173.8	202.1	28.3
Communication Arts	07	1999	135.3	196.4	61.1
Communication Arts	07	2000	141.5	198.7	57.2
Communication Arts	07	2001	147.0	202.0	55.0
Communication Arts	11	1999	123.2	187.8	64.6
Communication Arts	11	2000	124.8	188.0	63.2
Communication Arts	11	2001	133.5	192.3	58.8
Mathematics	04	1998	171.0	209.2	38.2
Mathematics	04	1999	175.3	213.8	38.5
Mathematics	04	2000	179.9	214.7	34.8
Mathematics	04	2001	183.5	216.4	32.9
Mathematics	08	1998	120.6	169.9	49.3
Mathematics	08	1999	122.6	169.9	47.3
Mathematics	08	2000	124.9	174.0	49.1
Mathematics	08	2001	130.1	177.0	46.9
Mathematics	10	1998	113.9	159.4	45.5
Mathematics	10	1999	116.4	164.8	48.4
Mathematics	10	2000	118.0	167.0	49.0
Mathematics	10	2001	125.2	172.0	46.8

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.5.2*: Concluded	

MAP Performance for Disabled and Non-Disabled Students (Concluded)

Content Area	Grade Level	Year	Index for IEP Students	Index for Non-IEP Students	Gap
Science	03	1999	182.6	209.2	26.6
Science	03	2000	190.5	219.4	28.9
Science	03	2001	195.6	220.2	24.6
Science	07	1999	128.9	173.5	44.6
Science	07	2000	132.8	175.1	42.3
Science	07	2001	137.0	173.0	36.0
Science	10	1999	129.6	171.9	42.3
Science	10	2000	128.3	170.2	41.9
Science	10	2001	136.3	176.6	40.3
Social Studies	04	2000	170.5	211.0	40.5
Social Studies	04	2001	184.9	216.1	31.2
Social Studies	08	2000	145.4	212.3	66.9
Social Studies	08	2001	152.0	212.6	60.6
Social Studies	11	2000	125.6	181.5	55.9
Social Studies	11	2001	137.6	188.4	50.8

Note: The Index is a weighted average of student performance across the five performance levels of the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). The Index ranges from 100, signifying that all students are in the lowest performance level, to 300, signifying that all students are in the highest performance level.

Committee Conclusions:
The data suggests that the performance gap between disabled and non-disabled students is decreasing for all subjects and grade levels. In general, the gap is decreasing more at the elementary level than at the middle and high school levels.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.5.3*: Do children with disabilities participate in alternate assessments at a rate comparable to national data? **Data Sources:** • Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A) data • Monitoring data **Related CSPD:** • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • MAP-Alternate Teaching Resource Guide	**Data Summary:** **MAP-Alternate Participation and Eligibility** **2000-2001 School Year** MAP-Alternate Portfolios* 536 MAP-Alternate Eligible Students** 1,538 Public School January Membership 876,414 Percent Eligible to Participate (Eligible Students / January Membership) 0.2% * Actual number of portfolios submitted ** Number of students eligible to submit a MAP-A portfolio during that year or during other years, however if a student did not meet eligibility requirements (ie. age) for that year, a portfolio would not be submitted. **Monitoring Data** FY2002 Monitoring Standard **State and District-wide Assessment-6** – Percentage participating in alternate assessments at each grade level is no greater than 1-2 percent of the student population at that grade level: not monitored in FY02 **Committee Conclusion:** Missouri's MAP-Alternate was first available for the 2000-2001 school year. Local educational agencies (LEAs) were to report students who had been determined eligible for the alternate exam even if the students would not be participating in the alternate exam during that school year. Based on this reporting it would appear that less than one half of one percent of the student population was eligible to participate in the alternate exam. This percentage is much lower than the standard of one to two percent of the student population. In addition to the eligible numbers being low, the actual number of MAP-Alternate portfolios was also very low. Final numbers are not yet available for the 2001-2002 school year, but the number of MAP-Alternate portfolios submitted increased by over fifty percent from last year. Increased technical assistance to districts along with monitoring which will begin to look at the MAP-Alternate participation should improve both the reporting of eligible students as well as the number of portfolios actually submitted.

Component BF.6*: To the maximum extent appropriate, are children with disabilities educated, including participation in nonacademic and extracurricular activities, with non-disabled peers?

Overview Answer: Placement data is showing an increase in placements in regular settings. Focus group data shows that students with disabilities are involved in nonacademic and extracurricular activities.
Strengths: The students in the focus groups reported that nonacademic and extracurricular activities were available to them and many took advantage of the opportunities. Those who did not participate said it was their choice not to participate. In one location, the resource teachers reported that they felt that students with disabilities, like students without disabilities, were sometimes reluctant to participate in extracurricular activities even though they were welcome and the activities were open to them. To counteract that reluctance, the teachers made it a point to get all their students involved in various committees and activities according to the students' interests. Once the students got involved in one activity, they were more apt to get involved in other activities. At this location, all the students in the focus group were on the prom committee and all were excited about attending the prom.
Areas of Concern: African-American students appear to be over-represented in self-contained settings.
Other Comments: Data is needed about individualized education program (IEP) team consideration of participation in extracurricular and nonacademic activities for each student's IEP. Missouri does not collect data related to participation in nonacademic and extracurricular activities of any student populations.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.6.1*: Is the percentage of children with disabilities in each disability category, served along each point of the continuum, comparable to national data? **Data Sources:** • Annual Report to Congress • Monitoring data	**Data Summary:**

Percent of Children Age 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments under IDEA, Part B During the 1999-2000 School Year

		Outside Regular Class <21%	Outside Regular Class 21-60%	Outside Regular Class >60%
All Disabilities	MO	51.93	31.62	13.14
All Disabilities	US	47.32	28.32	20.29
Specific Learning Disabilities	MO	51.38	40.81	7.21
Specific Learning Disabilities	US	45.32	37.85	15.78
Speech or Language Impairments	MO	84.99	12.45	2.39
Speech or Language Impairments	US	87.47	6.75	5.27
Mental Retardation	MO	5.92	28.05	51.61
Mental Retardation	US	14.05	29.48	50.50
Emotional Disturbance	MO	34.78	29.26	25.91
Emotional Disturbance	US	25.78	23.42	32.80
Multiple Disabilities	MO	9.78	17.51	46.74
Multiple Disabilities	US	11.19	18.70	43.07
Hearing Impairments	MO	41.28	25.56	15.89
Hearing Impairments	US	40.33	19.31	24.50
Orthopedic Impairments	MO	43.18	25.07	17.97
Orthopedic Impairments	US	44.35	21.93	27.72
Other Health Impairments	MO	55.59	31.52	10.69
Other Health Impairments	US	44.91	33.22	17.24
Visual Impairments	MO	51.45	16.18	5.56
Visual Impairments	US	49.10	19.50	17.69

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.6.1*: Concluded	

Percent of Children Age 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments under IDEA, Part B During the 1999-2000 School Year (Concluded)

		Outside Regular Class <21%	Outside Regular Class 21-60%	Outside Regular Class >60%
Autism	MO	27.41	21.45	41.88
Autism	US	20.64	14.45	49.91
Deaf-Blindness	MO	11.63	4.65	60.47
Deaf-Blindness	US	14.86	10.17	39.37
Traumatic Brain Injury	MO	35.64	32.34	25.08
Traumatic Brain Injury	US	31.06	26.61	31.60
Developmental Delay	MO	-	-	-
Developmental Delay	US	44.31	29.92	24.40

Source: Table AB2, http://www.ideadata.org/tables24th/ar_ab2.htm

Monitoring Data

FY2002 Monitoring Standard **Least Restrictive Environment-3** – The percentage of children with disabilities in each disability category, served at each point of the continuum, is comparable to statewide data: not monitored in FY02

Committee Conclusions:

For many of the disability categories, Missouri's percent of students in regular education classrooms is significantly higher than the national percent. Mental Retardation and Deaf-Blindness are low in the regular education setting (outside the regular classroom < 21%) as defined by a "P – 20% of P" criteria. Deaf-Blindness is high in the self-contained setting (outside the regular classroom > 60%) as defined by a "P + 20% of P" criteria. Several disability categories show over-representation in the Public Separate Facilities (Mental Retardation, Multiple Disabilities, Hearing Impairment, Orthopedic Impairment, Visual Impairment, Deaf/Blind and Traumatic Brain Injury) and Home/Hospital Environment (Specific Learning Disabilities, Mental Retardation, Orthopedic Impairment and Autism).

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.6.2*: Is the percentage of children with disabilities, by race/ethnicity, receiving special education comparable to the percentage of children, by race/ethnicity, in the general population?

Data Sources:

- State 618 data
- Total public school enrollment

Related CSPD:

- Access to the General Education Curriculum – Problem Solving for General Education Intervention
- English Language Learners (ELL) with Special Needs
- Quality Eligibility Decisions

Data Summary:

Special Education and Total Enrollment by Race
2001-2002 School Year

	Number of Students in Special Education	Proportion of Special Education Enrollment	Total Number of Students	Proportion of Total Enrollment
White	102,849	77.6%	703,886	79.0%
Black	27,068	20.4%	155,804	17.5%
Hispanic	1,712	*1.3%*	17,845	2.0%
Asian	567	*0.4%*	10,855	1.2%
Indian	321	*0.2%*	2,883	0.3%
Total	132,517	100.0%	891,273	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in italics (right) indicate under-representation according to the "P - 20% of P" criteria.

Placement by Race
2001-2002 School Year

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Regular (<21%)	81.4%	16.8%	*1.2%*	*0.5%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Resource (21% - 60%)	79.4%	18.5%	*1.5%*	*0.3%*	0.3%	100.0%
Self-Contained (>60%)	*60.1%*	**37.9%**	*1.3%*	*0.5%*	0.3%	100.0%
State Operated Schools	72.1%	**25.2%**	1.7%	*0.8%*	*0.2%*	100.0%
Separate Private	*55.2%*	**42.8%**	*1.3%*	*0.7%*	*0.0%*	100.0%
Separate Public	*57.7%*	**40.1%**	*1.1%*	*0.9%*	0.3%	100.0%
Homebound/Hospital	77.5%	**21.3%**	*0.6%*	*0.2%*	**0.4%**	100.0%
Residential Private	85.1%	*12.8%*	2.1%	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	100.0%
Residential Public	73.3%	**24.4%**	2.3%	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	100.0%
Total Student Population	79.0%	17.5%	2.0%	1.2%	0.3%	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in bold (left) indicate over-representation according to the "P + 20% of P" criteria.
Percentages in italics (right) indicate an under-representation according to "P - 20% of P" criteria.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION
BF.6.2*: Concluded	**Committee Conclusions:** Based on a "P +/- 20% of P" criteria as used in the Biennial Performance Report to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Missouri is not seeing over-representation of any racial/ethnic groups in our total special education numbers, however, when the data is disaggregated by placement, several areas of disproportionality are seen. The most significant area of over-representation is for African American students in self-contained settings. These results are consistent with the two previous years' data. At this time, the Division of Special Education (DESE) is working to determine the best way to address this issue. Disproportionality is now looked at as a part of the Monitoring Screening process and districts that appear to have issues with disproportionality will be more likely to receive an on-site monitoring visit. During the Spring of 2003, the division will conduct workshops for school districts that will present information on the use of data and compliance information in the management of the special education process in order to impact outcome for students with disabilities. An analysis of disproportionality data will be one of the topics covered.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND STRENGTHS FOR THIS QUESTION

BF.6.3*: Is the percentage of preschool children with disabilities served in settings designed for non-disabled children, comparable to national data?

Data Sources:

- State 618 data
- Annual Report to Congress

Related CSPD:

- Access to the General Education Curriculum
- Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment (Manual)
- Autism – Project Access
- ECSE Practices Manual
- ECSE Show Me How Technical Assistance Bulletins
- Heads Up Reading
- Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks
- Parents as Teachers: Supporting Families of Children with Special Needs Guide and Training
- Perspectives on Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
- Practical Parenting Partnerships
- Quality Eligibility Decisions

Data Summary:

Percentage of Children Ages 3-5 (including kindergarten students) Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B During the 1999-2000 School Year

	Missouri	50 States and PR*
Early Childhood Setting	43.47	36.14
Early Childhood Special Ed Setting	36.90	34.01
Home	3.39	3.64
Part-time Early Childhood/ Part-time Spec Ed Setting	1.08	12.86
Residential Facility	0.02	0.14
Separate School	4.39	4.39
Itinerant Services Outside Home	10.76	7.13
Reverse Mainstream	-	1.69

* Excludes Texas and the District of Columbia

Source: Table AB1, http://www.ideadata.org/tables24th/ar_ab1.htm

Committee Conclusions:

Additional data is needed to address this indicator, however the table above shows that Missouri's percentage in Early Childhood Settings is higher than the national percentage.