

# MO Part B

# FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

562

## General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

### General Supervision

Under federal statute and regulations, each state has a responsibility to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by local education agencies (LEAs). The system must be accountable for enforcing the requirements of the IDEA and for ensuring continuous improvement in outcomes for students with disabilities. The general supervision system in Missouri is the responsibility of the Office of Special Education (OSE). It is comprised of the following eight components:

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
2. Policies/procedures/effective implementation
3. Integrated monitoring activities
4. Fiscal management
5. Data on process and results
6. Improvement/correction/incentives/sanctions
7. Effective dispute resolution
8. Targeted technical assistance and professional development

### INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) implements a three-year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education. DESE uses a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. All federal programs within DESE are part of the monitoring process. The objectives of the tiered monitoring process include:

- Reduce the time spent in LEAs conducting on-site monitoring reviews
- Improve quality and efficiency of on-site reviews
- Monitor each LEA in a three year cycle
- Increase the number of LEAs meeting compliance
- Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

The tiered monitoring process is used to ensure adequate monitoring of all LEAs, along with additional opportunities to conduct more in-depth monitoring of LEAs with high-risk factors. Under the tiered monitoring process, LEAs are sorted into three cohorts, with approximately 200 LEAs per cohort.

Each cohort cycles through multiple tiers/levels of monitoring, including the following:

- Desk audit – a desk audit uses data reported through the state's data collection systems to annually monitor 100% of LEAs. Data include, but are not limited to, teacher certification, fiscal data, discipline, disproportionate representation, graduation rate, dropout rate, post-secondary transition, early childhood outcomes, dispute resolution, and student performance.
- Desk review – conducted on a three-year cycle through a self-assessment monitoring checklist and verification of the checklist. The self-assessment information is collected and reported through the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) for Special Education or the Tiered Monitoring System for other federal programs.
- Phone audit/Onsite – LEAs with fewer risk factors or areas of concern receive a telephone audit. LEAs that are identified with high risk factors receive an onsite review.

Monitoring reports are issued to all agencies reviewed during the three-year cycle.

The Special Education Compliance Section uses the tiered monitoring process to review LEAs for procedural compliance with IDEA Part B. Only the applicable cohort for the monitoring year will complete the self-assessment/desk monitoring level. This level of monitoring is completed through the web-based IMACS. The self-assessment/desk monitoring level serves as a tool for LEAs to determine where the LEA stands in regard to compliance with federal and state regulations, identify any noncompliance, and subsequently implement a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to correct any identified noncompliance.

The LEAs determined to be at the highest risk within the applicable cohort for the monitoring year are selected for on-site monitoring. High risk status is determined from the compilation of multiple factors from all programs within the DESE. Special Education Compliance looks at an LEA's performance in relation to the State Performance Plan (SPP) targets, dispute resolution

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

system data, and desk monitoring findings from the self-assessment. Telephone monitoring and review of submitted documentation are used to increase the number of LEAs participating in the monitoring process. On-site visits are coordinated with other federal programs when possible.

The training and preparation level gives LEAs an opportunity to attend trainings on procedural compliance; review LEA policies, procedures, and practices; and to become familiar with the Special Education Standards and Indicators Manual to ensure procedural compliance. In addition, this level allows LEAs additional time to implement and assess any changes resulting from the previous desk review and/or on-site visit.

For special education compliance, CAPs are required for all identified noncompliance, and any findings of noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the LEA's notification of the findings. In order to verify correction of noncompliance, additional data are requested as part of a follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance, and LEAs may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified. LEAs are expected to correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days, but in no case more than 12 months, of the receipt of the report of findings of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of IMACS and frequent contact with the LEAs by Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) compliance consultants and DESE compliance supervisors. LEAs are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months when they participate in the required self-assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance.

### **Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS)**

The OSE has a web-based general supervision management system called the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). The components of the system include compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionate representation, discipline reviews and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through the Department's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by LEAs to submit required information to the OSE for both the cyclical and annual review processes. LEAs are encouraged to use IMACS on a voluntary basis for improvement planning, implementation, evaluation, and self-monitoring.

### **DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM (STATE COMPLAINTS, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS)**

Timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required to ensure compliant dispute resolutions. Effective collection of data enables DESE to track the issues identified to determine whether patterns or trends exist. Additionally, through the tracking of the issues over time, it is possible for DESE to evaluate the resolution's effectiveness and determine whether resolution was maintained in future situations. It also allows the state to identify issues which may need to be addressed through technical assistance or monitoring procedures.

IEP facilitation is offered statewide beginning in the 2016-17 school year. Trained facilitators are available to implement the facilitated IEP process statewide. The OSE receives technical assistance from the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), as a member of the IEP Facilitation Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup #2.

### **MONITORING FOR COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)**

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA may not use more than 15% of the allocated amount under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER) grid, supporting documentation page, and CEIS Reporting Verification Form. The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the CEIS Reporting Verification Form must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER grid.

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with DESE staff from the Special Education Compliance, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections as needed. Through approval or disapproval of the Part B FER, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

### **MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE**

As indicated above, DESE implements a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The Special Education Finance Section uses the tiered monitoring process to review LEAs for fiscal compliance of IDEA Part B federal funds, along with other special education funding sources.

All LEAs, regardless of cohort, go through the desk audit level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, proportionate share carryover release requests, and final expenditure reports (FERs).

All LEAs in the applicable cohort for the fiscal year, as well as selected high risk LEAs identified through the risk assessment process, complete the self-assessment/desk monitoring level. This level of monitoring is completed through the web-based Tiered Monitoring System. The self-assessment/desk monitoring level serves as a tool for LEAs to determine where the LEA stands in regard to compliance with federal fiscal regulations, identify any deficiencies, and subsequently implement procedural changes to correct such deficiencies.

The LEAs determined to be highest risk for the fiscal year are selected for on-site monitoring. High risk status is determined through the risk assessment process which considers multiple factors which may include: late budget application, allocation amount, carry-over amount, late FER submission, A133 audit findings, cash management plan assignments, financial distress, change in special education or fiscal staff, failure to complete self-assessment as required during the prior year, and the number of desk monitoring findings from the self-assessment. In addition, telephone monitoring and review of submitted documentation is used as needed for selected high risk LEAs.

The training and preparation level gives LEAs an opportunity to attend regional trainings on fiscal compliance; review LEA policies,

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

procedures, and practices; and to become familiar with the Special Education Fiscal Monitoring Guide to ensure fiscal compliance. In addition, this level allows LEAs additional time to implement and assess any changes resulting from an on-site visit the previous year.

The fiscal areas reviewed during the monitoring cycles may include the following:

- Obligation of Funds
- Period of Availability
- Account Coding and Cash Management
- Internal Controls
- Procurement
- Allowable Costs/Use of Funds
- Time and Effort
- Equipment
- Capital Outlay
- Proportionate Share
- Coordinated Early Intervening Services
- Maintenance of Effort (MOE)

For the self-assessment/desk monitoring, telephone monitoring, and on-site monitoring levels, LEAs must correct deficiencies identified in CAPs.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

The State implements a comprehensive system of technical assistance to ensure that LEAs, families and students with disabilities understand and can effectively and efficiently implement the statutory requirements of the IDEA and achieve improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

**STATE COMPLIANCE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

To help LEAs prepare for the monitoring self-assessment, the Department provides annual training/technical assistance to assist the LEA in completing the desk review self-assessment checklist for compliance monitoring (see attachment) and fiscal compliance. Training is conducted in a variety of formats (face-to-face, webinars, Frequently Asked Questions) and at various times and locations to accommodate participation by LEA staff. Technical assistance is provided through phone and e-mail communication, as needed.

**REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS**

The Department contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri. The purposes of the regional services are:

- To implement improvement activities (see Attachment) which will assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators specified in the Special Education State Performance Plan (SPP) for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and in meeting the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) of improving the performance of students with disabilities as well as ensuring that students with disabilities graduate and are college and career ready.
- To expand the state’s capacity to provide timely regional services to buildings and LEAs with identified noncompliance and/or low performance for students with disabilities (SWDs).

Over 100 regional consultants in the following capacities provide training and technical assistance to LEAs throughout the State:

- Special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development to both special and general education teachers and administrators and provide ongoing coaching related to improving performance for students with disabilities.
- Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor LEA SW-PBS coaches/facilitators and otherwise support LEAs in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to LEAs to assist them with IDEA compliance requirements, compliance self-assessments, as well as writing and implementing CAPs.
- Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Collaborative Work (CW) consultants provide professional development, technical assistance and coaching to CW buildings/LEAs in collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making and effective teaching practices aligned with the CW.
- Professional Learning Community (PLC) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for PLC implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor building/LEA PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/LEAs in implementation of PLC.

These personnel at the RPDCs are collectively referred to as “RPDC consultants” or “consultants.”

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Project ACCESS provides autism and other pervasive developmental disorder (PDD) resource information, professional development and technical assistance to LEAs across Missouri and is 100% funded by the Department.

Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials individuals to present these courses through the RPDCs. Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators working with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs).

The Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD. BEAT coaches are chosen and trained to aid specific LEAs based on Project ACCESS criteria, which includes significant knowledge and expertise in ASD and reflect Project ACCESS' philosophy toward education of children with ASD.

### **MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (MSB) OUTREACH SERVICES**

MSB provides outreach services to families and LEAs across the state in the areas of visual impairment, blind, and deaf/blind. The following projects/activities are a major part of this outreach:

- Deaf/blind Technical Assistance Program
- Library Media Center
- Missouri Instructional Resource Center
- MoSPIN\*
- Professional Development
- Service Provider Listings
- Vision Education and Orientation & Mobility

\*Missouri Statewide Parent Involvement Network (MoSPIN) is a statewide, home-based program to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired. MoSPIN provides direct, in-home parent education through specially trained "parent advisors." The program is designed for parents of children who are visually impaired and who may also have other disabilities (developmental delay, hearing impairment, physical impairment, etc.). MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct service to the child.

### **MISSOURI SCHOOLS FOR THE SEVERELY DISABLED (MSSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM**

Outreach services available through the MSSD are designed to support LEAs serving students with moderate/severe disabilities. Assistance includes resources, personalized technical assistance and staff training. The following projects/activities are a major part of this outreach:

- Regionally-based resource libraries
- Technical assistance
- LEA staff development related to instructional practice, curriculum and assessment
- IEP technical assistance specific to a student

### **MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF (MSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM**

The Resource Center on Deafness at MSD is Missouri's main source for programs, services, information, and resources supporting the educational needs of deaf and hard of hearing children. The MSD Resource Center provides a comprehensive range of programs and services to Missouri's deaf and hard of hearing children, their parents, and their LEAs from birth until high school graduation in order to maximize their educational achievement and psychosocial development. The Resource Center provides:

- American Sign Language (ASL) classes
- Families First: An early intervention program serving families of deaf and hard of hearing children from birth through age 8
- Parent advisors: Professionals in a deaf-related field such as deaf education, speech pathology, audiology, or ASL interpreting
- Audiology services
- Newborn hearing screening (required for all children)
- Comprehensive hearing evaluations
- Auditory Processing Disorder testing
- Hearing aid selection counseling, programming, fitting, cleaning, and repair
- Hearing aid bank
- FM System leases
- Speech-language assessments
- Community education and professional development: Workshops, in-service training, and informational presentations for LEAs, hospitals and clinics, and parent and community organizations.
- The Shared Reading Project: Supports literacy and language acquisition by helping parents learn to read to their deaf or hard of hearing child in ASL. Books and accompanying materials are loaned to families, and specially trained deaf adults tutor parents in effective ways to read to their deaf and hard of hearing children.

### **MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY (MSU) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Through a contract with the OSE, the MSU Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic provides consultative services to LEAs in Missouri educating children who have cochlear implants. Consultations and training are designed to enhance teacher and LEA knowledge and skills to carry out the services to increase student achievement.

### **MISSOURI SCHOOLWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS (MO SW-PBS)**

The mission of MO SW-PBS is to assist schools and LEAs in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at the school, LEA, regional, and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the National Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the University of Missouri PBIS Center, both of which are supported by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Through a contract with the OSE, the MPACT manages a volunteer Parent Mentor Program to provide support to families of children with disabilities throughout the special education decision making process. Support includes providing resources and information regarding special education law and process, assisting parents to plan for school meetings and/or attending IEP or other school meetings with families. Mentors also help parents understand their role in the IEP process. Mentors complete a required training curriculum that assists in their work with families. The MPACT staff meets with the mentors on a quarterly basis for additional updates and training.

**COLLABORATIVE WORK (CW)**

The Missouri Collaborative Work is an educational framework which emphasizes the use of collaborative teams and data based decision-making to support effective teaching and learning practices at the classroom level with the goal of improved outcomes for all students, especially students with disabilities.

Missouri Collaborative Work is focused on visible teaching and learning. This work is informed by the research synthesis conducted by Dr. John Hattie and his continued work to create visible learning schools. The Moving Your Numbers study, conducted under the guidance of the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO), articulates the need for focusing on a few things using a systems approach. Their work clarified the need for alignment of state, regional, LEA, building and classroom efforts. Additional guidance was provided through the continued work of educational, implementation science, professional development, and coaching leaders (i.e. Robert Marzano, the National Implementation Research Network [NIRN], Jim Knight, Richard Dufour, and others). The primary message of Dr. Hattie's work is "Know Thy Impact." Making teaching and learning visible in Missouri is building school-wide models in which teachers and students maintain a teacher/learner relationship characterized by the following:

- Teachers set learning intentions and success criteria aligned to Missouri Learning Standards
- Teachers use effective instructional practices, conduct frequent checks for understanding, and provide specific feedback
- Students are taught how learning intentions and success criteria are relevant and applicable, to articulate the extent to which learning has occurred, and identify needs for additional practice

CW buildings participate in:

- Selection, mastery and implementation of a variety of effective instructional practices which have been proven to have a high effect on student outcomes
- Development and administration of common formative assessments (CFA) by grade-level and aligned to the Missouri Learning Standards of mathematics or English Language Arts at least five times annually
- Efficient and effective collaborative data teams at the building level using classroom data to make instructional decisions
- Monthly reports of data analysis

It is expected that students with IEPs will participate in the grade-level CFAs just as they do other classroom assessments, either with or without accommodations as indicated on their IEP. If a student is receiving all or most of their instruction in the general education classroom, then they should take the CFAs.

<b>Attachments</b>			
	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Uploaded By</b>	<b>Uploaded Date</b>
No APR attachments found.			

**Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

**REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS**

Continuous professional development is provided for the following consultants located in the nine RPDCs: Compliance Consultants, Improvement Consultants, SW-PBS Consultants, PLC Consultants and CW Consultants. The professional development is provided through monthly team meetings, webinars and/or shared learning events with OSE staff related to the described scope of work according to the contract with the Department. The required meetings are designed to develop the capacity of the regional consultants to provide high quality professional development (HQPD) in their regions in order to assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators specified in the SPP and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). These targets and indicators are focused on improving the performance of all students, but especially students with disabilities, so they will graduate and are college and career ready.

**STATE PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT GRANT (SPDG)**

In October 2012, the state was awarded a five-year SPDG. This SPDG is using lessons learned from the prior grant to begin implementing a more focused school improvement process called the Missouri Collaborative Work (CW) with an emphasis on HQPD at the state, regional, LEA and building levels. The CW has four major areas of focus: Collaborative Data Teams, Effective Teaching/Learning Practices, Formative Assessment and Data-based Decision Making (see "Collaborative Work" above). Throughout the grant period, approximately 300 schools have participated in the CW project each year. Professional development in the four focus areas has been developed and used to train state and regional PD providers who disseminate the information to staff in the identified buildings. Building staff form collaborative data teams that identify effective teaching/learning practices to implement in a selected area (English/language arts or math). All staff are trained in the practice. After training, staff develop and administer CFAs to measure student progress and using a data team process, identify students for re-teaching and retesting. A cadre of State Implementation Specialists (SIS) have been trained and are evaluating the activities of the project to ensure that all activities meet standards of HQPD and are implemented with fidelity at all levels of the system to meet OSEP's standards for HQPD. The overall goal of this project is improved outcomes for all students, but especially for students with disabilities.

**DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)**

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Dynamic Learning Maps is the state alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The Department has trained staff in the Office of College and Career Readiness Assessment Section and the OSE on the administration of the DLM, as well as the instructional support system which accompanies the assessment. These staff regularly train the RPDC Improvement Consultants on this same information so consultants can effectively train LEAs across the state. In addition, DLM staff works with and trains all RPDC Improvement Consultants annually on new information and technology available to educators. The RPDC Improvement Consultants provide training and technical assistance statewide to educators administering the DLM Alternate Assessment.

### DESIRED RESULTS DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE (DRDP) ©

The Missouri State Board of Education adopted the DRDP ©, a research-based, observation readiness tool, as the Department's recommended early childhood instrument for use with preschool age children. Eleven regional consultants were provided training by WestEd to become credentialed Certified Coach Trainers. These consultants provide statewide training for professionals who work with preschool age children on use of the DRDP © instrument.

### MISSOURI DROPOUT PROJECT

The Missouri Dropout Project is a coordinated evidence-based professional development system to assist high schools and feeder middle schools with developing, implementing, maintaining, evaluating and sustaining a comprehensive dropout prevention program for all students. The project provides professional development training activities for schools in the areas of intervention, re-entry, recovery, re-engagement and reconnection. In addition, the project assists schools in the development of data collection systems to track students at risk of dropping out due to academic, behavioral and social emotional difficulties.

### MISSOURI POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS PROJECT

Missouri Post-Secondary Success Project is a multi-year improvement process which assists schools in embedding college and career competencies in curriculum through professional development for teams. The overall goal of this work is to support teams of high and middle school professionals to expand the college and career competencies (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cognitive skills) of students through data-based decision making, multi-tiered instruction and interventions, and collaboration. The college and career competencies provide a unifying vernacular that supports school personnel, families, community members, and students to work together to improve post-secondary outcomes for all students. Outcomes of the project include: increased intra- and interpersonal student competencies; improved academic and behavioral achievement; increased graduation rates; and improved post-school outcomes of students with and without disabilities. The implementation stages are structured such to optimize successful start-up, purposeful innovation, scaling-up, and sustainability. Stages of implementation include exploration, initial implementation, full implementation, and sustainability. Full implementation and sustainability involve a collaborative effort between parents, community members and educators to develop a culture of supporting youth with college and career competencies that lead to positive post-secondary outcomes.

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 1, 2017 meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data and then a comparison across each of the nine state designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were those between regions that were predominantly rural or urban. The panel members appreciated the more in-depth look at the state numbers and requested we continue with the more detailed look. They also wanted to be assured that students with disabilities are held to the same standards as all other students.

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

#### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

##### Public Reporting of LEA Data

The Special Education Profiles are the public reports of 2016-17 district data and are posted on the Department's Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal website at <https://mcds.dese.mo.gov/guidedinquiry/Pages/Special-Education.aspx>. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target, including Indicators 9 and 10.

##### Public Reporting of Statewide Data

5/10/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at [https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/StateProfile\\_2017.pdf](https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/StateProfile_2017.pdf) as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.

The SPP and APR documents are posted on the Department website at <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a Special Education Listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

<b>Attachments</b>			
	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Uploaded By</b>	<b>Uploaded Date</b>
No APR attachments found.			

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥									70.00%	71.50%	72.00%
Data								68.60%	72.80%	73.36%	75.27%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	72.50%
Data	76.56%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	5,761	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	7,437	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	77.46%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
5,761	7,437	76.56%	73.00%	77.46%

**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The State of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri's public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those guidelines include the following provisions:

- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:
  1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
  2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
  3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.
- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.70%	4.50%	4.30%	5.00%	4.90%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%
Data		5.60%	5.70%	5.70%	4.90%	5.00%	4.20%	4.10%	4.00%	2.92%	3.08%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	4.80%
Data	2.36%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
840	38,214	2.36%	4.80%	2.20%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Calculation is an annual event dropout rate = number of IEP dropouts from grades 9-12 / number of IEP students in grades 9-12.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

Dropouts include any students who exit high school without receiving a high school diploma (receiving a certificate, reaching maximum age, dropping out). Conditions for dropping out for students with disabilities are the same as for all students.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.30%	97.30%	99.64%	97.20%	99.70%	99.30%	99.40%	99.50%	99.54%	99.88%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.30%	99.30%	99.57%	99.60%	99.60%	99.20%	99.40%	99.50%	99.50%	99.89%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.86%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	99.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	65,082	64,751	99.86%	95.00%	99.49%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	64,965	64,574	99.86%	95.00%	99.40%

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple locations on DESE's MCDS Portal:  
5/10/2018

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State, district and school level data including state level participation and proficiency, and district and building level participation:

<https://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Pages/Special-Education.aspx>

State and district level Special Education Profiles:

<https://mcids.dese.mo.gov/guidedInquiry/Pages/Special-Education.aspx>. "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. View Report. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

State, district and building level data including the Alternate Assessment subgroup:

"Achievement Level 4 Report – Public"

<https://mcids.dese.mo.gov/guidedInquiry/Achievement%20Level%20%20Levels/Achievement%20Level%20Report%20-%20Public.aspx>

Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (District Overall or select Schools), Content Area(s), Category (Special Programs and Total), Type (IEP MAPA, IEP\_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). View Report.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2016 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts was updated by the SPP/APR Helpdesk to match the state assessment EDFacts re-submission dated February 27, 2018. The update to the disaggregated data did not result in a change to the overall participation numbers or percentages on the FFY 2016 Data page.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			42.90%	51.00%	59.20%	67.40%	75.50%	56.20%	57.90%	23.20%	26.49%
			Data		15.90%	17.60%	19.06%	23.58%	26.20%	27.00%	27.40%	25.80%	23.22%	26.49%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			35.80%	45.00%	54.10%	63.30%	72.50%	56.40%	58.60%	26.40%	17.32%
			Data		18.70%	20.90%	22.70%	25.82%	29.20%	29.60%	29.80%	28.40%	26.46%	17.32%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	27.00%
		Data	29.17%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	18.00%
		Data	18.63%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	58,317	16,720	29.17%	29.00%	28.67%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	58,100	10,562	18.63%	20.00%	18.18%

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple locations on DESE's MCDS Portal:

State, district and school level data including state level participation and proficiency, and district and building level participation:

<https://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Pages/Special-Education.aspx>

State and district level Special Education Profiles:

<https://mcds.dese.mo.gov/guidedinquiry/Pages/Special-Education.aspx>. "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. View Report. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

State, district and building level data including the Alternate Assessment subgroup:

"Achievement Level 4 Report – Public"

<https://mcds.dese.mo.gov/guidedinquiry/Achievement%20Level%20%204%20Levels/Achievement%20Level%204%20Report%20-%20Public.aspx>

Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (District Overall or select Schools), Content Area(s), Category (Special Programs and Total), Type (IEP MAPA, IEP\_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). View Report.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2016 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts was updated by the SPP/APR Helpdesk to match the state assessment EDFacts re-submission dated February 27, 2018. The update to the disaggregated data did not result in a change to the overall proficiency numbers or percent on the FFY 2016 Data page for the Reading Assessment, but it did result in a slight change in numbers and percent for the Mathematics Assessment.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.50%	1.20%	1.00%	0.80%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	1.80%	1.80%
Data		2.11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.20%	0.40%	0.19%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	1.80%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.86%	3.00%	2.85%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

Missouri previously used all districts as the denominator for Indicator 4A. The new measurement table now requires that the denominator be the number of districts that met the State's minimum n size. This significantly decreases the denominator and thereby increases the percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy. Due to this measurement table change, the state is changing targets accordingly.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

The Special Education Advisory Panel was supportive of the proposed changes to baseline and targets for Indicator 4A due to the measurement table change. Since the measurement for Indicator 4A is a percent of LEAs meeting certain criteria, they understood that in order to interpret and meaningfully impact the data, it was necessary to better understand how data is collected and reported by LEAs; to examine the underlying discipline rates for students with disabilities; and to consider revising the definition of "significant discrepancy." Additional information will be provided to the panel over the course of the next two years in preparation for establishing the new set of targets for the next iteration of the State Performance Plan.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 499

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1	35	0%	2.86%	2.86%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4A:  
5/10/2018

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum n-size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every district in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

Using 2015-16 data, 35 LEAs met the minimum cell size of at least 10 long-term out-of-school removals.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2015 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 563 LEAs reported in FFY2015 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and component districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 35 LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size
- Results in 499 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data. Monitoring procedures specify that the first year a district meets the criteria to be identified as having a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, based on two consecutive years of data, the district is subject to a comprehensive review of policies, procedures and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The comprehensive review consists of a district self-assessment, student file reviews, and interviews with district staff to verify data. For each subsequent, consecutive year that a district's data indicates a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, the district will participate in a modified review. The modified review consists of a district self-assessment and interviews to verify data with district staff. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the district's discipline policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Should the district be identified for a period of five consecutive years, the year following the fifth year, the district will begin a new five year monitoring cycle and again be subject to a comprehensive review.

No LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy for this reporting period.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5/10/2018			

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Corrected Within One Year	Corrected	
0	0	null	0

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0.70%	1.60%	0.20%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 496

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	0	38	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4B:

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum n-size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities in the racial/ethnic group (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students of all racial/ethnic groups (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every district in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2015 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 563 LEAs reported in FFY2015 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and component districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 38 LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size
- Results in 496 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs for each race/ethnicity. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data. Monitoring procedures specify that the first year a district meets the criteria to be identified as having a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, based on two consecutive years of data, the district is subject to a comprehensive review of policies, procedures and practices. The comprehensive review consists of a district self-assessment, student file reviews, and interviews to verify data with district staff. For each subsequent, consecutive year that a district's data indicates a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, the district will receive a modified review. The modified review consists of a district self-assessment and interviews to verify data with district staff. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the district's discipline policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities, by race or ethnicity, and determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Should the district be identified for a period of five consecutive years, the year following the fifth year, the district will begin a new five year monitoring cycle and again be subject to a comprehensive review.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥			60.00%	59.00%	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%	59.50%	59.50%	56.00%	56.00%
		Data		57.40%	55.80%	57.08%	58.00%	58.40%	58.60%	58.90%	58.10%	58.10%	57.65%
B	2006	Target ≤			10.90%	10.80%	10.40%	10.30%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
		Data		11.20%	10.60%	10.01%	9.80%	9.60%	9.30%	9.40%	9.40%	9.11%	8.92%
C	2006	Target ≤			3.45%	3.40%	3.60%	3.55%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.70%	3.70%
		Data		3.70%	3.70%	3.72%	3.80%	3.70%	3.60%	3.60%	3.50%	3.63%	3.66%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	56.00%
	Data	57.59%
B	Target ≤	10.20%
	Data	8.76%
C	Target ≤	3.70%
	Data	3.61%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%
Target B ≤	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
Target C ≤	3.70%	3.70%	3.65%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	110,936	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	63,628	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	9,516	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	3,405	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	622	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63,628	110,936	57.59%	56.00%	57.36%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,516	110,936	8.76%	10.20%	8.58%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	4,029	110,936	3.61%	3.70%	3.63%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									47.30%	29.00%	30.00%
		Data								47.20%	47.20%	47.01%	45.14%
B	2011	Target ≤									22.80%	32.00%	31.00%
		Data								22.90%	22.90%	22.68%	24.15%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	31.00%
	Data	44.19%
B	Target ≤	30.00%
	Data	25.02%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.00%	33.00%	47.30%
Target B ≤	29.00%	28.00%	22.80%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	17,687	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</a>	7,699	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	4,120	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	225	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education	7,699	17,687	44.19%	32.00%	43.53%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
and related services in the regular early childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,345	17,687	25.02%	29.00%	24.57%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						83.30%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.83%	92.70%
		Data					92.60%	91.90%	93.90%	93.40%	94.10%	93.83%	94.76%
A2	2013	Target ≥						49.90%	55.60%	55.60%	55.60%	48.10%	45.00%
		Data					55.50%	53.50%	51.70%	52.90%	51.30%	48.10%	45.97%
B1	2013	Target ≥						84.30%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.48%	93.80%
		Data					93.70%	93.50%	95.60%	94.90%	96.60%	95.48%	95.80%
B2	2013	Target ≥						38.10%	42.40%	42.40%	42.40%	40.51%	37.00%
		Data					42.30%	42.10%	40.80%	43.50%	43.30%	40.51%	37.97%
C1	2013	Target ≥						81.50%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.48%	90.70%
		Data					90.60%	91.20%	93.00%	92.50%	93.90%	93.48%	93.61%
C2	2013	Target ≥						54.50%	60.70%	60.70%	60.70%	56.79%	53.00%
		Data					60.60%	59.40%	57.00%	58.50%	59.50%	56.79%	54.19%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	92.70%
	Data	94.98%
A2	Target ≥	45.00%
	Data	47.16%
B1	Target ≥	93.80%
	Data	96.35%
B2	Target ≥	37.00%
	Data	38.89%
C1	Target ≥	90.70%
	Data	95.23%
C2	Target ≥	53.00%
	Data	56.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	92.70%	92.70%	93.90%
Target A2 ≥	45.00%	45.00%	48.20%
Target B1 ≥	93.80%	93.80%	95.50%
Target B2 ≥	37.00%	37.00%	40.60%
Target C1 ≥	90.70%	90.70%	93.50%
Target C2 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	56.90%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5433.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	62.00	1.14%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	131.00	2.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2804.00	51.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1593.00	29.32%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	843.00	15.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4397.00	4590.00	94.98%	92.70%	95.80%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2436.00	5433.00	47.16%	45.00%	44.84%

Reasons for A2 Slippage

For Indicator A2, the state had a decrease of 2.32% from 2015-16 to 2016-17, and did not meet the 2016-17 target by 0.16%. The statewide change was primarily due to decreases of over six percent in two of the largest regions in the state. These two regions had A2 percentages of 43.2% and 41.5%, and since the regions account for over 48% of the children with ECO ratings, they had significant impact on the statewide results. The low A2 percentage in one of the regions was primarily driven by one large LEA which had an A2 percent of 25%. While children in this LEA are substantially increasing their rate of growth (95.8% for Summary Statement A1), the LEA is indicating that the children are not functioning within age expectations at time of exit. The low A2 percentage in the second region was, in general, seen region-wide. Similarly, the children in this region are substantially increasing their rate of growth (96.3% for Summary Statement A1), but a lower than average percentage of children are reported as not functioning within age expectations at time of exit.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	73.00	1.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	82.00	1.51%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3175.00	58.44%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1747.00	32.16%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	356.00	6.55%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4922.00	5077.00	96.35%	93.80%	96.95%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2103.00	5433.00	38.89%	37.00%	38.71%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	72.00	1.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	130.00	2.39%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2282.00	42.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1926.00	35.45%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1023.00	18.83%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4208.00	4410.00	95.23%	90.70%	95.42%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2949.00	5433.00	56.86%	53.00%	54.28%

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years?** Yes

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** No  
**Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."**

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1–5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument to gather data for this indicator. Therefore, an approved list of instruments has not been compiled. However, the State of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the recommended instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, training began for ECSE staff in the administration of this assessment. Some ECSE programs began voluntary usage of the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year. The DRDP continues to be the recommended Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool, but the number of LEAs using this instrument is unknown.

Regardless of the instruments used, the Decision Tree for Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Rating Discussion and the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) are available to assist ECSE personnel in synthesizing information into a comprehensive summary. The Decision Tree is a technical assistance document that assists ECSE personnel in reviewing the assessment results and determining an appropriate ECO rating. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department. The Decision Tree is located online at <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/ecodecisiontree1-25-13.pdf>, and the MOSS is located at <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MissouriOutcomesSummarySheetREV1109.pdf>.

No sampling is used for gathering ECO data. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more are assessed. Entry and exit data must be determined within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely." All entry and exit data collected during a given year is submitted electronically to the Department at the end of that school year. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

More information can be obtained at <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training>.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			77.00%	72.50%	75.00%	77.50%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Data		76.50%	69.40%	72.30%	69.60%	69.30%	71.40%	77.80%	77.60%	74.52%	73.57%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	70.00%
Data	75.65%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4880.00	6712.00	75.65%	70.00%	72.71%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	14.47%	46399.00
---	--------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

The Department utilizes a single survey for all students with disabilities. Districts are instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of all students with disabilities which includes preschool students.

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 12% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

The 2017 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 188 LEAs (cohort) that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes.

Each cohort includes approximately one-third of the LEAs in the state (including public charter schools and other public agencies

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

responsible for provision of educational services). LEAs in each cohort were selected based on size within each region and across the state. This assured an equal distribution of the LEAs in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium and small LEAs from urban, suburban and rural settings. LEAs in each cohort also represent the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

The monitoring cohort surveyed during the 2016-17 school year included 188 LEAs. Responses were received from 178 LEAs (94.7% LEA response rate), which represented approximately 98% of the students with disabilities in the cohort's LEAs. A total of 6,712 surveys were completed, 41% by mail and 59% electronically. The return rate for 2016-17 data was 14.5% which was a 2% decrease from the prior year. The mean LEA response rate was 27.0%; the median LEA response rate was 20%. Of the 10 LEAs that did not have any survey responses, five had fewer than 50 students with disabilities.

In order to determine representativeness of the data, respondents' geographic location was examined via Regional Professional Development (RPDC) areas. The response rates were similar across regions, with a slightly larger than expected percent of responses from the Kansas City region and slightly lower than expected from St. Louis. This is due to several larger LEAs in the Kansas City region that had high response rates. The state will continue following up with LEAs that have lower response rates.

"Age of student" was also examined via the school types of Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary. The data table below indicates that responses by school type (proxy for age of student) are representative of the state since the percent of responses was within 10% of the percent of child count for each school type.

	% Responses	% Child Count
Missing	0.8%	
Preschool	12.2%	10.0%
Elementary	51.2%	61.0%
Secondary	35.8%	29.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Data analysis also suggests that the respondents are racially/ethnically representative of the state. The following table shows the racial/ethnic distribution of children receiving special education services in the state, the LEAs in the monitoring cohort surveyed in the 2016-17 school year, and the LEAs in the monitoring cohort that had survey responses. The table shows similar demographics across the three sets of LEAs.

	White	Black	Hispanic	Multi-racial	Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander
State	71.4%	18.3%	5.3%	3.4%	1.0%	0.5%	0.1%
LEAs Surveyed	77.1%	11.8%	5.4%	3.8%	1.3%	0.5%	0.1%
LEAs with Survey Responses	77.3%	11.6%	5.3%	3.9%	1.3%	0.5%	0.1%

The review of data by geographic location, age of student and race/ethnicity indicates that the parents that responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Was a survey used?** Yes  
**Submitted survey:** [Parent Survey](#)

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** Yes

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2016 data are from a response group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response**

See the description above of how the state has ensured that response data represent the population based on a review of geographic location, age of student, and race/ethnicity.

However, we do recognize that the higher the response rate, the better the data. Therefore, in addition to our current practices, we plan to conduct additional follow-up with LEAs that have lower response rates in order to increase overall return rates for the survey.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 424

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	109	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state’s identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

Using a cell size of 20 students with disabilities for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, the following numbers of LEAs were examined for disproportionate representation:

- White: 106
- Black: 55
- Hispanic: 47
- Asian: 11
- Native American: 6
- Pacific Islander: 1
- Multi-racial: 35

A total of 109 LEAs had the minimum cell size for one or more racial/ethnic groups.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 5/10/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2016 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 562 LEAs reported in FFY2016 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and component districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 109 LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size
- Results in 424 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a 5-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a comprehensive review is required. The second through fifth consecutive years an LEA is identified, a modified review is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the fifth year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a comprehensive review starting a new monitoring cycle. The comprehensive review is comprised of a self-assessment, student file reviews, and staff interviews. The modified review is comprised of a self-assessment and interviews. Whether a comprehensive or modified review takes place, no onsite visit is typically conducted; however, at any point in the process, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.19%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 480

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
6	0	53	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state's identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2016 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 562 LEAs reported in FFY2016 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and component districts

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 53 LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size
- Results in 480 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

### Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a 5-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a comprehensive review is required. The second through fifth consecutive years an LEA is identified, a modified review is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the fifth year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a comprehensive review starting a new monitoring cycle. The comprehensive review is comprised of a self-assessment, student file reviews, and staff interviews. The modified review is comprised of a self-assessment and interviews. Whether a comprehensive or modified review takes place, no onsite visit is typically conducted; however, at any point in the process, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary.

The six LEAs identified through data analysis as having disproportionate representation were reviewed using monitoring procedures described in the previous paragraph. Four of the LEAs received comprehensive reviews and two received modified reviews. In all six of the LEAs, policies, procedures and practices were found not to result in inappropriate identification.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The FFY2014 (2014-15) APR reported that one LEA had a corrective action ordered due to findings of noncompliance in evaluation and identification procedures and practices resulting in disproportionate representation of African American students with intellectual disabilities. These findings were issued during the 2015-16 school year on February 9, 2016. Noncompliance was cited for four indicators across multiple students for a total of 21 findings.

To verify the public agency was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the noncompliance noted in the report, the agency was required to do complete the following:

- Submit documentation for all Corrective Action Plans (CAPS) no later than 12 months from the date of the report by providing five additional samples for each CAP indicator.
- Contact the Southeast Regional Professional Development Center (SERPDC) to access resources suitable to the issues of professional development of professional staff in the area of evaluation and identification of students with disabilities, especially in the disability category of Intellectual Disability (ID). Documentation of the technical assistance must be submitted to DESE and include agenda, presenter and attendance. This technical assistance applies to all staff involved in the evaluation of students suspected of a disability.
- Work with the SERPDC to access resources suitable to provide all instructional staff with professional development on evidence-based systems of instruction that meet the needs of all students. Submit evidence of completion by providing agenda, presenter and attendees.
- Develop a system to track and review on a regular basis the referrals for special education: by name, age, grade, race, initial referral date, referral source (agency/parent), referral decision (no evaluation warranted, evaluation warranted) evaluation date, eligibility decision (eligible, not eligible) and if found eligible, category of disability and placement category. Data collection was to be initiated in the 2016-17 school year. Submit data collected to DESE.

All documentation was received and verified, and all noncompliance was cleared within 12 months of the date of the initial report.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As a result of the on-site findings the LEA was ordered to address all individual cases of noncompliance through Individual Corrective Action Plans for Students (I-CAPS). Upon completion of each ICAP, the LEA submitted to DESE the evaluation report, IEP and Notices of Action (NOA) to evaluate with assessment, and changed the disability category or placement, if applicable. In addition to the eligibility staffing with parents which may have resulted in a revised IEP, the consideration of eligibility to participate in the state alternate assessment had to be documented and submitted.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

All required documentation was submitted prior to December 15, 2016, and was verified by OSE staff in order to clear all individual non-compliance within 12 months of the date of the initial report.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.70%	94.00%	97.08%	97.80%	96.80%	97.80%	97.90%	97.60%	98.99%	97.97%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.81%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
8,892	8,844	98.81%	100%	99.46%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	48
---	----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Delays for the 48 children ranged from eight days to 90 days. The longest delays were due in part to excessive numbers of snow days, school breaks and inability to contact parents. While these reasons are considered acceptable extensions to the timelines, the reasons did not fully explain the total delay so LEAs were cited for noncompliance with the timelines. A small number of delays were due to staff not being available to complete the evaluations or waiting for interpreters.

In general, the unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable included valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluations; or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts’ compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

The data are gathered in the web-based IMACS. Districts enter the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's name
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data is completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned Department staff.

The file review process includes checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts include initial evaluation timelines which are not within 60-days, the following criteria are accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather (per State Regulation)
- Agency vacation days (per State Regulation)
- Child's absence because of illness (per State Regulation)
- Summer break (per State Regulation)
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child (per 300.301(d))
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

Delays are considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions do not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the districts fail to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
137	137	null	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Data above correspond to the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR. Data reflecting the 2014-15 school year, and reported in the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2015, which is FFY 2015.

In FFY2015, there were 137 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children with initial evaluations. The state verified through this follow-up that all 37 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

In FFY2015, there were 137 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 37 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 137 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.40%	80.30%	88.60%	91.30%	95.00%	96.60%	95.50%	93.90%	98.83%	95.45%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.51%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	704
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	105
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	404
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	188

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	404	410	97.51%	100%	98.54%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	6
--	---

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

For the six children for whom the IEP was not developed and implemented by the third birthday, the delays ranged from three days to 73 days. All but two delays were less than one month. Reasons for the longest delays involved families cancelling or delaying meetings and guardianship issues.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for Part C to Part B transition, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report this information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the 5/10/2018 Page 38 of 49

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three-year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

Data were gathered in the web-based IMACS which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's name
- Date of birth
- Date of referral to ECSE
- Date of referral to First Steps (Part C)
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible? (Y/N)
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	null	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Data above correspond to the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR. Data reflecting the 2014-15 school year, and reported in the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2015, which is FFY 2015.

In FFY 2015, there were 19 individual child level findings of noncompliance in eleven LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children who transitioned from Part C to Part B. The state verified through this follow-up that all eleven LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

In FFY 2015, there were 19 individual child level findings of noncompliance in eleven LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all eleven LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 19 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						91.30%	79.40%	82.30%	87.50%	88.63%	88.58%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	88.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
647	738	88.29%	100%	87.67%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The special education monitoring is done on a three-year continuous cycle of Year 1 - self-assessment submitted for desk review, Year 2 - correction of identified noncompliance and Year 3 - training for improvement.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

Districts complete a file review on transition age students and address the following statements for each student:

- 200.610.b: For students beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child is 16, post-secondary transition is stated as a purpose of the meeting, at least annually or whenever post-secondary transition is to be discussed at the IEP meeting.
- 200.710.b: For IEP meetings addressing secondary transition services, the child is invited.
- 200.710.c: If the child was age 16+ and did not attend any meeting where the purpose is the consideration of post-secondary goals, documentation must be present that the child's preference and interests related to transition services were considered at the IEP meeting.
- 200.790.a: No later than the child's 17th birthday, the IEP includes a statement that the child has been informed of the rights under IDEA that will transfer to the child upon her/his 18th birthday.
- 200.800: The IEP for each student beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child reaches 16 years of age and updated annually includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 200.800.a: A measurable postsecondary goal (or goals) that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.
- 200.800.b: Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s).
- 200.800.c: Transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.d: If appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- 200.800.e: The measurable postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment.
- 200.800.f: The transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.g: The transition services were developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests.
- 200.800.i: There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed.

Compliance supervisors review and verify district documentation based on the above standards. Districts identified with noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Documentation of correction is submitted for review and verification. Onsite reviews may be conducted based on performance data and focused areas for review.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
81	81	null	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Data above correspond to the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR. Data reflecting the 2014-15 school year, and reported in the FFY 2014 (2014-15) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2015, which is FFY 2015.

In FFY 2015, there were 81 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 62 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of IEP secondary transition plan data. The state verified through this follow-up that all 62 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

In FFY 2015, there were 81 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 62 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 62 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 81 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
		Data						23.38%	30.20%	31.60%	29.20%	29.13%	31.03%
B	2009	Target ≥							46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
		Data						45.94%	53.10%	54.30%	53.50%	55.62%	59.49%
C	2009	Target ≥							51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%
		Data						50.33%	58.60%	59.70%	57.70%	60.58%	64.79%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	24.40%
	Data	29.55%
B	Target ≥	46.90%
	Data	60.89%
C	Target ≥	51.30%
	Data	65.90%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
Target B ≥	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
Target C ≥	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7200.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2052.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2244.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	226.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	107.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2052.00	7200.00	29.55%	24.40%	28.50%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4296.00	7200.00	60.89%	46.90%	59.67%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4629.00	7200.00	65.90%	51.30%	64.29%

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

School districts in Missouri are responsible for contacting every youth who is no longer in secondary school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left school in order to determine the follow-up status for each youth. Districts conduct this census follow-up annually. As indicated above, Missouri does not sample for this indicator – all districts collect information and report on each former student the year following exit. The districts report that follow-up status on every youth to the Department via a student-level data collection mechanism utilizing a unique student identification number (MOSIS ID). Using the MOSIS ID, the state is able to require that all graduates and dropouts from the prior year have a follow-up status submitted. The statewide data that are reported for Indicator 14 therefore include follow-up on every graduate and dropout from the prior school year. This indicates that the data are 100% representative of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, since they are all included in the data.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			50.00%	35.00%	35.10%	35.20%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data		46.90%	46.20%	48.80%	44.00%	55.20%	19.61%	44.12%	41.03%	37.84%	44.44%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	35.30%
Data	52.94%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	23	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	39	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
23	39	52.94%	35.30%	58.97%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			62.50%	35.00%	35.10%	35.20%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data		66.70%	55.50%	64.70%	81.30%	90.00%	95.30%	72.00%	94.29%	90.00%	87.50%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	35.30%
Data	80.95%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	8	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	18	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4	8	18	80.95%	35.30%	66.67%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		18.40%	19.40%	20.90%
Data	17.40%	24.20%	28.40%	29.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	22.40%	23.90%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

Missouri's State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is to increase the percent of students with disabilities in tested grades who perform at proficiency levels on state assessments (excluding alternate assessments) in English/Language Arts in the Collaborative Work schools by 6.5 percentage points by FFY 2018.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See uploaded document.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See uploaded document.

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

See uploaded document.

Description

See uploaded document.

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

See uploaded document.

**Theory of Action**

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

**Infrastructure Development**

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

**Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices**

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

**Evaluation**

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

**Technical Assistance and Support**

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Stephen Barr

Title: Assistant Commissioner

Email: stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov

Phone: 573-751-4444