

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously established targets. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 72.82%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously established targets. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 5.24%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 4.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 10.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 34%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.64% for reading and 99.57% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.36% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.31% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 19.06% for reading and 22.66% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 17.63% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 20.89% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 51.0% for reading and 45.0% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.2%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 documentation of the correction of the remaining FFY 2005 noncompliance. The State reported that remaining noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
[Results Indicator]	<p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p>	<p>Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again describe the review and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>										
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>										
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1219 1467 1463"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">55.8</td> <td align="center">57.08</td> <td align="center">59.0</td> <td align="center">1.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.8	57.08	59.0	1.30%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress								
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.8	57.08	59.0	1.30%								

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
<p>placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p>	<p>10.6</p>	<p>10.01</p>	<p>10.8</p>	<p>0.60%</p>				
	<p>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>3.78</p>	<p>3.72</p>	<p>3.4</p>	<p>0.06%</p>				
	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The revised targets are less rigorous for 5A and 5C and more rigorous for 5B than the previously established targets.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>These data represent progress for 5A, 5B, and 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for 5A or 5C but met its target for 5B.</p>								
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>				<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1284 1419 1463"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1284 1062 1463">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1284 1178 1463">Social Emotional</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1284 1293 1463">Knowledge & Skills</td> <td data-bbox="1293 1284 1419 1463">Appropriate Behavior</td> </tr> </table>				07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior						

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.4	1.3	0.8	
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1.9	1.9	3.6	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.3	53.3	36.9	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	15.0	15.5	15.3	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	53.4	28.0	43.4	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 72.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 69.44%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 72.5%.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.08%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88.60%. These reported data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 80.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 82.50%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 73.23%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all fifty of its findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 74.58%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 73.48%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 74.0%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,105 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2007 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised an improvement activity for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised an improvement activity for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 48.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 46.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 35%.</p>	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 64.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 55.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 35%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>