

# **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**

## **MISSOURI PART B**



2008-2009

Submitted February 1, 2010

Revised April 9, 2010

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: ..... 1

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma ..... 7

**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school..... 14

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: ..... 16

- A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

**Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:..... 21

- 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.

**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: ..... 25

- 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

**Indicator 6:** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: ..... 28

- 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.

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: ..... 29

- 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.

**Indicator 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..... 31

**Indicator 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. .... 34

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. .... 37

**Indicator 11:** 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. .... 40

**Indicator 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. .... 44

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. .... 48

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: ..... 50

- 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.

**Indicator 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. ... 51

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. .... 57

**Indicator 17:** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. .... 59

**Indicator 18:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements..... 61

**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. .... 63

**Indicator 20:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. .... 65

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2008-09 (Federal Fiscal Year 2008 which covers the time period from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009).

**Process used to develop the APR:** Staff from the Compliance, Effective Practices and Data Coordination sections of the Division of Special Education met regularly throughout the year to review and analyze data related to SPP targets and determine whether SPP improvement activities are being implemented and are effective in helping the state meet its targets. Tools such as the OSEP SPP/APR Calendar are used to help the workgroup structure its activities, and an internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities was also developed and is used regularly as a management tool. Stakeholder input is also crucial, and a draft of the APR and proposed SPP changes in targets and improvement activities are presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) prior to submission for their review and input.

**Public reporting of district data:** Public reports of 2008-09 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website, under School Data and Statistics at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district.

**Public reporting of statewide data:** 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 Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Special Education State Profile is posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/datacoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf>. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a special education listserv which is disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders, and these resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

**MOSIS and Core Data:** The DESE began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007-08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System, or MOSIS. Prior to that, the Core Data Collection System (a web-based data collection system with interactive edits) was used to gather data from districts. MOSIS includes a variety of edit checks which will help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14.

**IMACS:** The Division has developed a web-based general supervision management system, called IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006-07 school year and data from the system is used to address districts' performance on the SPP Indicators. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews, and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Division for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

**Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators:** DESE began the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006-07. MSIP is the state's general school accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Division of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much

more performance based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most activities that are required of districts by the Division are based on the State Performance Plan indicators and whether the district met threshold levels related to the targets established in the SPP. If, during their MSIP review year, a district did not meet a performance threshold, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to any performance area not met.

**Onsite Reviews:** Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004-05 and 2005-06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). In 2008-09, seven districts were selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program). Based upon the data, three of the seven districts were identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, and four of the seven districts were identified in only the area of elementary achievement. Data analysis by DESE staff and Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants occurred prior to the review, and a hypothesis was developed to try to identify root causes of the district's poor performance. While onsite, the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered was reviewed by the team and used to support or deny the hypothesis. Exit conferences were held with district staff to report the team's findings and answer any questions from the districts.

Within six weeks of the review, the districts received reports of the findings which included a Corrective Action Plan, when necessary. The districts were required to respond to the findings of the review through an Improvement Plan and subsequent Activity Reports.

The Division of Special Education's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used by the DESE Division of School Improvement for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006-2007 school year. The MSIP and the special education onsite reviews, which are aligned and complement each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both reviews.

**Improvement plan and scoring guide:** Improvement planning is used for both Improvement Grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans was developed that functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on DESE's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of the web-based systems of Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGS). The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan.

**Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants:** The Division has been awarding improvement grants to districts on a competitive basis for the past four years. The improvement plan described above serves as the grant application. District training on the improvement planning with scoring guides is held in the fall of each year and is available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level, in order to promote changes leading toward improved outcomes for students with disabilities. The districts submit activity reports during the year which serves as a progress report and an expenditure report.

Seventy-nine grants were awarded in the area of Elementary Achievement for 2008-2009. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support implementation of initiatives such as: Response to Intervention (RtI), School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Co-teaching, Check and Connect, Reading First (RF), Differentiated Instruction (DI),

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), and Aimsweb.

In addition, 28 grants were awarded funding for improvement in the post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities for 2008-2009. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support implementation of initiatives such as: Response to Intervention (RtI), Transition Outcome Project (TOP), Co-teaching, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Wilson Reading, Differentiated Instruction (DI), School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Check and Connect, Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM), High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Aimsweb.

Eighty-four elementary achievement and 38 secondary transition grants were awarded for 2009-10. Grants continue to fund professional development to support the implementation of systems change initiatives.

**Consultants:** DESE contracts with nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts. The Division of Special Education supports the following consultant positions:

- Nineteen Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans. These consultants also participate in Reading First training opportunities and collaborate with other RPDC staff to improve reading performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels in Reading First and non-Reading First schools.
- Thirteen School-wide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Five Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews, and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Three Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Nine Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called “RPDC consultants” or “consultants.”

**MO Resources (MORE):** The DESE, in conjunction with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), supports a web-based system called MO Resources (MORE). This system provides information on topics related to the SPP Indicators. The topics are: Academic Achievement, Disproportionality, Dispute Resolution, Dropout, Early Childhood Outcomes, Early Intervening Services(EIS)/Three Tiered Models of Intervention(RtI), Graduation, LRE (preschool age), LRE (school age), Parent Involvement, Post-secondary Transition, and Suspension and Expulsion. Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-based Practice, Online Resource, Definition, Exemplar. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address: <http://more.northcentralrrc.org/>.

**Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network:** The mission of Missouri School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) Network is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed for an effective learning environment are in place for all students. This network is comprised of a State Coordinator and thirteen regional consultants who provide building and district level support across a spectrum of implementation issues. Missouri SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the OSEP-funded PBIS National Center located at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The state team is scaling-up available support to districts through two state-wide consultant position types (Secondary and Tertiary Level Consultants and a Data/Web Consultant). The Secondary and Tertiary Level Consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for buildings that have met criteria at the universal level. These consultants

also train regional consultants to provide implementation assistance at these tiers. The Data/Web Consultant is working to formalize a cohesive system of SW-PBS data collection available to review at building, district, and state levels. This position also offers state-wide support across all implementation levels-to be available on the [www.pbissmissouri.org](http://www.pbissmissouri.org) website (tools, examples, etc). Active SW-PBS buildings are categorized into an implementation phase based on established criteria. The categories include: Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver, and Gold. 133 buildings were recognized in June 2009 for having met the criteria at the Bronze, Silver or Gold levels. These buildings qualify as state demonstration sites who share data and information on implementation of SW-PBS with the state as well as other schools. The SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop State-wide standardized training across all levels for various audiences from bus drivers to superintendents and across all training levels-building, district, regional, and state.

**Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) & State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG):** Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education, Missouri has been researching, developing, and implementing an integrated 3-tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes eleven essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, response to intervention and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. Districts spent 2008-09 planning and preparing and will begin implementation in 2009-10. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. The results of this evaluation will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at [www.mimschools.org](http://www.mimschools.org).

**Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech Pilot:** During 2008-09, the enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. eMINTS is a national center that works to enhance education through professional development including in-classroom support in technology rich classrooms. eMINTS classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation, SmartBoard and projector, scanner, printer, and digital camera, one computer for every two students and specific software. The grant was expanded in the 2008-09 school year to include eMINTS and Special Education classrooms in two new pilot districts. Technology was upgraded in the eMINTS classrooms and the Special Education classrooms received the eMINTS technology package. Teachers participated in training in the use of the text to speech software and introductory exposure to other types of assistive technology. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the grant.

**Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities:** The Division of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November of 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Division staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, division staff has worked to review and revise all existing Improvement Activities, align the activities with all contractual activities, and develop Action Plans with implementation and impact measures for every activity. The detailed Action Plans and evaluation measures may be found at the following website: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**DESE Contract Development and Management System in Form Hog:** In May, 2008, the Division of Special Education contracted with the company Form Hog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line Contract Development and Management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all information related to vendor contracts (e.g. contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, as well as processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool is currently being developed. This tool enables the Division to evaluate

vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

**Response to Intervention:** Missouri is one of eight states chosen to receive intensive technical assistance from the *National Center on Response to Intervention (Rtl)*. This level of technical assistance includes ongoing support for planning, implementing, and evaluating Rtl scale-up and implementation. To show Missouri's commitment to statewide implementation of three-tiered models of intervention, the State has established a strong level of cooperation across the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Divisions of Special Education, School Improvement, and Career Education as well as the inclusion of outside agencies (e.g. Center for Advancement of Mental Health Practices in Schools at the University of Missouri, funded by the IDEA Partnership) to address student needs and ultimately increase student achievement. The State's current action plan with the National Center includes identified action steps include linking Rtl implementation with other state three-tiered model initiatives such as School-wide Positive Behavior Supports, High Schools that Work and Professional Learning Communities, development of a support plan for scaling-up Rtl across the state, increasing knowledge and capacity of Rtl implementation of district staff, and development of an assessment tool to collect data on current practices related to Rtl implementation throughout the state. While Missouri's work with the National Center is currently in its initial stages, the immediate goal is to develop and coordinate a statewide system for Rtl professional development as well as establish model demonstration sites throughout the state. In addition, messages are provided through the Division's listserv regarding three-tiered model webinars and other professional development provided by the National Center on Response to Intervention. Research articles, tools, and resources that schools may find beneficial in their systems change initiatives are also disseminated.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education supports the use of three-tiered models of intervention for use by districts to positively affect student achievement as demonstrated by the collaborative work among the Divisions of Special Education, Career Education, and School Improvement in this area over the past three years. As an extension of this work, the *Director of Three-Tiered Model Coordination* was created. The director reports to the three assistant commissioners and represents collaboration in funding by all three divisions as well as outside partners involved in school mental health and systems change. The purpose of this position is to focus on promoting, coordinating, and aligning three-tiered models of intervention throughout the state. The director works with the National Center on Response to Intervention as our state contact. Another responsibility is to carry out three-tiered model promotion in conjunction with other agencies (e.g. Center for Advancement of Mental Health Practices in Schools at the University of Missouri) to improve achievement for all students.

As a part of this work, the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) are hosting Response to Intervention (Rtl) summits to assist in establishing an awareness level of Rtl. These summits feature presentations from the national and state perspectives on Rtl and its alignment with other initiatives. Schools currently implementing Rtl are showcased along with discussion about resources to assist districts in exploring initial steps to implementation. These events are a collaborative effort among the Missouri RPDCs, DESE Divisions of School Improvement, Career Education and Special Education, North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), National Rtl Center, Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center (MC3), and Midwest Equity Assistance Center.

**Monitoring Process of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS):** Using the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), districts report the use of IDEA Part B funds to provide CEIS to students in kindergarten through grade 12 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. All districts that reported using IDEA Part B funds to provide CEIS during the 2008-2009 school year were sent a letter indicating the intent to monitor the use of funds and asking the districts to complete and submit the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet no later than October 31, 2009 to the Division of Special Education. The CEIS Reporting Sheet collects the following information:

- The date the CEIS activity occurred.
- The description of the CEIS activity that occurred.
- The cost of the CEIS activity.
- The titles of all participants that attended the activity (i.e. 4th Grade Reading Teacher)

- The number of special education students served by the CEIS activity (this number should be zero as CEIS is for students without an IEP)
- The funding sources to verify that districts aren't supplanting CEIS funds.
- The group(s) benefiting from the CEIS activity.

The CEIS Reporting Verification Sheets are reviewed by the CEIS committee, a cross-sectional committee consisting of a staff member from the Compliance, Funds Management, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections. The CEIS committee evaluates district data submitted on the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheets for the following requirements:

- Verify that the professional development provided to teachers and other school staff who enable such personnel to deliver scientifically based academic and behavioral interventions, including scientifically based literacy instructions, and, where appropriate, instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software was appropriate under CEIS.
- Verify that the educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction being provided was appropriate under CEIS.
- The CEIS expenditure did not exceed the total allowed CEIS allocation.
- Students receiving CEIS services were not identified as special education students.
- Funds for CEIS activities supplemented and not supplanted Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) activities.
- The LEA did not exclusively use CEIS funds for groups significantly over identified.

Upon review of district documentation, the CEIS committee informs districts of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the district is required to return these funds.

**Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)**

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma  
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	75.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Per instructions for the APR, 2007-08 data is reported for this 2008-09 APR. The data match the graduation rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Year	Number of Graduates with IEPs	Number of Cohort Dropouts	Graduation Rate
2007-08	6,874	1,718	<b>80.0%</b>

Graduation Rate = Number of graduates with IEPs / (Number of graduates + Number of cohort dropouts)

Missouri is not yet able to calculate the graduation rate as established under the ESEA for any groups of students. Data collection changes were made in 2007-08 to collect a “first-time freshman” flag which will allow the state to begin using the ESEA graduation rate calculation for the 2010-11 graduates.

The state has not yet revised targets in the ESEA accountability workbook, since the data needed for the ESEA graduation rate calculation are not yet available. Therefore, targets in the SPP have not been revised to match the targets established under Title I of the ESEA. The targets in the SPP will be revised in conjunction with future revisions to the accountability workbook for Missouri.

Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEP.

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.
- 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.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Missouri, with a graduation rate of 80.0% reported for ESEA purposes, met the target established for 2007-08. Due to the changes in the data source and calculation, progress/slippage from the previous year cannot be determined. The changes in the data source and calculation were made per OSEP instructions for the APR.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Establish systems for sharing data to assess impact of career education and vocational rehabilitation services on post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities
- Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) in order to establish a collaborative interagency group which will develop and oversee the implementation of a coordinated statewide plan for effective transition services
- Provide data to technical assistance providers to enable them to identify and provide TA/PD to districts in need of assistance in order to improve performance on this indicator
- Disseminate evidence-based practices through a searchable database (MORE)
- Develop and maintain online Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field of transition and interact with other transition educators throughout the state
- Identify “models of success” in postsecondary transition programs using established criteria
- Develop and disseminate training on high quality transition planning
  - Online needs assessment
  - Online courses
  - Compliance/SPP 13 trainings
- Increase number of districts that offer the Missouri Option program
- Conduct annual transition institute for districts and other stakeholders to disseminate information in the area of postsecondary transition
- Enhance state capacity to provide Technical Assistance and Professional Development in the area of Post Secondary Transition through the recruitment and support of a cadre of Transition Liaisons in each of the nine RPDC regions
- By 2010-11, develop Community Transition Teams in each of the nine RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of students' post-secondary transition plans to ensure successful outcomes

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Systems for Sharing Data:** With the implementation of student level data collections in 2008-09, data from different Divisions within DESE is more easily shared and analyzed. MOSIS data includes information on special education and career/technical education, so those data variables can be cross-referenced where before there was no way to connect the data in a meaningful way. Division staff is

working with Career and Technical Education staff to determine a direction for data analysis purposes. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation does not currently use the MOSIS system, however there have been discussions about using the MOSIS IDs so that the Vocational Rehabilitation data can be linked to K-12 data.

**MITT:** In the summer of 2007, the DESE, as part of their work with the University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition, formed a Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT). This team is comprised of representatives of agencies within the state that impact post-secondary outcomes for Missouri students, parents and other stakeholders. The purpose of the MITT is to identify critical needs in the area of post-secondary transition at the state level, to share data across agencies for post-secondary transition, and to work together to create positive post-secondary outcomes, to develop a vision for impact, to develop content training related to data from Community Resource Mapping, create an action plan, and to assist with developing a model for scaling up and sustainability.

As a state-level group with a shared vision of improving transition outcomes for students with disabilities, the MITT has made tremendous gains in increasing information sharing, coordination of statewide activities, and collaboration at the state level. Furthermore, the MITT supports the development of local community transition teams in Missouri by attending local trainings and providing critical information.

At the Fall 2008 Annual Retreat, the MITT reviewed statewide data from several sources and identified two goals: (1) to learn about youth both with and without disabilities in Missouri who drop out of school and do not complete, and (2) understand dropout prevention and successful programs in Missouri which decrease dropout. To this end, the MITT requested support from the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), and has received technical assistance and ongoing support. Technical assistance will be provided to seven Missouri schools that have identified dropout rates among all students, both disabled and nondisabled above 4 percent. The NDPC-SD will assist schools in drilling down data and identifying areas of need, as well as assistance in identifying evidenced based interventions to impact the number of students who drop out. Work with the National Center is a collaboration among three divisions of DESE: Career Education, School Improvement (regular education) and Special Education.

The MITT continues its work through “field trips” to exemplar schools and programs (e.g., Rolla Career Technical Education Center, the Lighthouse Program in St. Louis, and the Cape Girardeau Public Schools).

**Data to Targeted Technical Assistance Providers:** Performance data by district and region is provided annually to technical assistance providers to enable them to identify and provide technical assistance and professional development to districts in order to improve performance in areas of need. Using the data, consultants targeted districts for technical assistance. This technical assistance included participation in initiatives described below and in the Overview of this APR.

**Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** See the Overview of this APR for a description of the Missouri Resources (MORE) website.

**Online Community of Practice:** The DESE in collaboration with the University of Kansas developed a website that houses the Missouri Transition Community of Practice (CoP) [www.missouritransition.org](http://www.missouritransition.org). In addition to the ongoing sharing and problem solving dialogue, and links to evidence-based practices and online professional development modules, three *Ask the Expert* event topics were identified with the year’s training priorities of employment and interagency collaboration in mind. DESE staff recommended the April/May topic based upon their conversations with districts throughout the state. The *Ask the Expert* events were as follows:

- Employment Overview – Cary Griffin, Griffin & Hamiss – Oct. 20-31, 2008
- Missouri Vocational Rehabilitation – Brenda Simmons, Dorothy Parks, Barbara Hoelzer; Missouri Vocational Rehabilitation – Feb.2-13, 2009
- Transition and Youth with Autism – Julie Donnelly, Project ACCESS and Autism Support Services – April 20 – May 1, 2009

**Models of Success:** During 2007-08, an initial three districts were identified as having high quality models for providing transition services by the KU Transition Coalition and DESE. This

identification was done through a nomination process. In August 2008, the Transition Coalition initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in providing transition services. This identification process includes adapting selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it is specific to Missouri. This process includes a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model will work with the transition coalition to create a description of the program. The Missouri Community of Practice will provide graphic and text information about the models on [www.transitioncoalition.org](http://www.transitioncoalition.org). Four Models of Success were identified by DESE in the 2007-2008 year, their final descriptions and additional materials were developed for online dissemination by the Transition Coalition during the 2008-2009 year. These Models are:

- Career Training Program (CTP) – Special School District, St. Louis
- BASE Project – Springfield
- Hospital Transition Program – Rolla
- Culinary Arts Program - Raytown

An additional four Models of Success were identified and developed during the 2008-2009 year. These Models are:

- Transition Portfolio – Pierce City
- Campus Tours – Knob Noster
- Using Text to Speech to Improve Transition Outcomes – Missouri Assistive Technology Project
- Transition Portfolio – Nevada

Currently identified Models of Success are highlighted on the Transition Coalition and Missouri Community of Practice websites, [www.transitioncoalition.org](http://www.transitioncoalition.org) and [www.missouritransition.org](http://www.missouritransition.org).

**Curriculum on High Quality Transition Planning:** Several resources relating to high quality transition planning are available and include the following:

- **Online Needs Assessment:** The online needs assessment Quality Indicators of Exemplary Transition Programs Needs Assessment Instrument (QI) was developed in 2006 and is available to districts on a voluntary basis. Districts attending the annual Transition Institute are required to complete the needs assessment and the results are used to develop action plans during the Transition Institute. Data from the needs assessment are also provided to DESE and is used to determine the technical assistance and professional development needed by the field as well as inform the MITT regarding action planning for statewide transition activities. The three areas of need identified during 2007-08 included interagency collaboration, transition assessments and compliance. The identified need for transition assessments resulted in a December 2008 training for districts.
- **Online Courses:** During 2008-09, twenty district level personnel completed online courses offered by the KU Transition Coalition. The courses include:
  - a. Introduction to Transition Education and Services
  - b. Transition Assessment
  - c. Family Involvement and Student Involvement in Transition
  - d. Preparing Students for Employment and Postsecondary Education
  - e. Interagency Collaboration during Transition Planning

The KU Transition Coalition also developed several forms of statewide training to assist RPDCs in providing high quality, consistent training to Missouri school districts. The Transition Coalition adapted the online training module Best Practices in Transition Planning to include Missouri specific content, information, activities and resources. It utilizes the Missouri IEP form as an example to inform compliance with Indicator 13 and uses additional Missouri specific links and resources. This training was made available in March of 2008.

- Multiple face-to-face trainings were offered in transition planning during the 2008-2009 school year including:
  - 2008 DESE Transition Institute
  - Transition Assessment Workshop
  - Interagency Collaboration & Summary of Performance for Secondary Transition Workshop
  - Community Transition Team Development Training
  - Transition Outcomes Project Training

More than 550 transition professionals representing 203 districts attended one or more of the trainings. Professionals from 85 additional districts across the state attended transition-related workshops through their Regional Professional Development Centers.

**Missouri Option Program:** The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who have the capabilities to complete Missouri High School Graduation Requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. DESE is working with the Division of Career Education to better disseminate information about the program and collect data on the districts offering the program and the impact on students with disabilities.

**Transition Institute:** The DESE 2008 Transition Institute was held in Springfield, Missouri, July 20-22, 2008. The 2 ½ day institute included: (a) a keynote speech by Dr. Ed O’Leary, an expert in the field of secondary transition planning; (b) transition compliance and Form C training; (c) presentations from adult service agencies; (d) district action planning; and (e) breakout strands for school counselors, general education teachers and special education teachers. Registrations for the Institute were completed by 258 practitioners interested in secondary transition. These registrants traveled to the Institute from across all nine regions of the state.

The DESE 2009 Transition Institute was held in Springfield, Missouri, July 15-18, 2009. The 2 ½ day institute included: (a) a keynote speech by Dr. Sandra Covington Smith, from the National Dropout Center for Student with Disabilities who is an expert in the field of student engagement. Presentations from Vocational Rehabilitation, Community Transition Teams, Transitions Liaisons and secondary practitioners all focused on the areas agency collaboration, transition assessments and student engagement. The Institute also included district action planning; and breakout strands for school counselors, general education teachers and special education teachers. Registrations for the Institute were completed by 320 practitioners interested in secondary transition. These registrants traveled to the Institute from across all nine regions of the state.

Plans for future institutes include adding strands for Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health and the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT).

**Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The DESE contracted with Dr. Ed O’Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to DESE staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition is assisting with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data are collected through the TOP training.

The Transition Outcomes Project was developed by Dr. Ed O’Leary and is evidenced-based. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Emphasizes improving transition services, increasing graduation rates, showing results and increasing the likelihood that students with disabilities will graduate and be employed.
- Empowers local school divisions to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs, and approaches.

In the 2008-2009 school year, 60 districts participated in TOPs. Of these 30 were in their first year of the process where they attended the TOPs training, analyzed IEPs from their district, reported this information to all secondary special education staff in their district, and developed an action plan to improve transition planning and services.

The other 30 districts were in their follow-up year where they re-evaluated IEPs from their district to identify gains in Indicator 13 compliance. Recognition awards were given to 18 districts that showed substantial gains.

**Transition Liaisons:** The Missouri Transition Liaison Program was developed in 2007 to improve transition education and services in the State of Missouri by identifying local level high performing district-level transition coordinators, secondary special education teachers & work study coordinators across Missouri. The model is adapted from both the New Mexico Transition Specialist Cadre and the Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative mentor Program. Currently, twenty Missouri Transition Liaisons communicate regularly and meet three times a year to network, share information, plan trainings, and inform statewide transition activities.

In 2008-09, Missouri Transition Liaisons:

- provided input into statewide guidance documents and forms, such as a statewide training on Interagency Collaboration and the Summary of Performance,
- reviewed newly developed professional development trainings and resources,
- collaborated online and in-person with other transition liaisons, RPDC Consultants, Transition Coalition and the DESE, and;
- disseminated information on effective Post Secondary Transition practices at the district, regional, and state levels.

Finally, Missouri Transition Liaisons participated in a poster session at the Missouri Transition Institute in 2009, where they illustrated effective practices in transition at the local level. Missouri Transition Liaisons devote time and energy to improve transition in Missouri through increased communication and collaboration with the Regional Professional Development Centers, the Transition Coalition, and the DESE.

**Community Transition Teams:** In the 2008-09 school year, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Transition Coalition partnered to support the formation of eight Community Transition Teams across Missouri. Through a systemic change approach, the focus of the Missouri Community Transition Team training is to:

- Provide an understanding of transition planning, services and research-based effective practices in transition as a framework for educators, students, families, administrators, interagency personnel, community partners, and employers, to ensure that they have the necessary knowledge and tools to improve post-secondary outcomes for transitioning youth;
- Provide training and technical assistance in developing a strategic plan for community-wide transition systems;
- Improve access to and availability and appropriateness of employment opportunities and other post-school activities as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); and
- Elevate community awareness of, and commitment to the improvement of post-secondary outcomes, in part through use of a searchable website of regional community resources and information related to specific transition outcome areas. The KU Transition Coalition populated the database by entering data about Rehabilitation Services and Centers for Independent Living throughout the state. Community transition teams at the local level began identifying resources available within their regions and including them in the database during 2008-09. The database is searchable by zip code, district, county, topic and agency name. The website for the database is [www.transitioncoalition.org](http://www.transitioncoalition.org). The searchable Missouri Community Agency Database has been expanded to include 245 state, regional, and local agencies that can support students as they transition from school to adult life. Community

Transition Teams continually update and input resources specific to their community to the online, searchable agency database.

Eight Community Transition Teams, chosen during the 2008-09 school year through an application process, attended three-two day training sessions (October 2-3, 2008, December 4-5, 2008 and March 5-6, 2009) in Jefferson City, Missouri. Community Transition Teams are comprised of a minimum of six members with at least one representative from each stakeholder group below;

- School-based transition coordinators and/or school personnel
- Family members
- Vocational Rehabilitation Services staff.

Additional key partners include representatives from Developmental Disability Services, UMKC-Institute for Human Development, Community Employment Specialists, Regional Professional Development Center Transition Consultants; Department of Mental Health (DMH), Missouri Parents ACT (MPACT), Mental Health, and local Community Colleges.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP since the change made in the February 2009 APR/SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school  
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	4.3% dropout rate for students with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Per instructions for the APR, 2007-08 data is reported for this 2008-09 APR. The data match the dropout rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Year	Number of Dropouts with IEPs in Grades 9-12	Number of IEP Students in Grades 9-12	Dropout Rate
2007-08	1,874	38,016	<b>4.9%</b>

Dropout Rate = Number of dropouts with IEPs in grades 9-12 / Number of IEP students in grades 9-12

A dropout is an individual who:

1. Was enrolled at the end of the previous school year, did not return to school after summer vacation and was not enrolled at any time during the school year, or
2. Was enrolled during the regular school term and was not enrolled on the last day of that same school term; and
3. Has not graduated from high school; and
4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - a. Transferred to another public school, nonpublic school, home school; or
  - b. Temporary absence due to suspension or verified illness; or
  - c. Death; or
  - d. Reenrolled on or before the enrollment count date of the following September.

This definition applies to all students, including students with disabilities.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state did not meet the 2007-08 target for the dropout rate, Due to changes in the data source and calculation, progress/slippage from the previous year cannot be determined, however, trend data shows that the number of dropouts has been decreasing over the past several years. The changes in the data source and calculation were made per OSEP instructions for the APR.

The state's dropout rate is largely due to high dropout rates for two large urban districts. Many of the improvement activities outlined in Indicator 1 are being implemented with these two urban districts.

Specific technical assistance and professional development for one or both of these districts includes the following: Transition Outcomes Project; School-wide Positive Behavior Supports; Professional Learning Communities; Quality Eligibility Determination; co-teaching; differentiated instruction; Response to Intervention; a Statewide Transition Institute. DESE staff and RPDC Consultants are working directly with district leadership to conduct needs assessments and provide ongoing coaching and evaluation of improvement activities.

Missouri signed a Memorandum of Understanding in the fall of 2009 establishing a partnership with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD). The NDPC-SD will provide technical assistance in creating Model School in Missouri. These efforts will be directed at schools rather than districts. The selection process for schools to participate in this project was based on schools already identified by the Division of Career Education to participate in a Statewide Dropout Summit. The number of districts meeting these criteria was 164 of the 448 high school districts in the state. This list of schools identified as having high numbers of dropouts were evaluated based on existing programs to impact dropouts, and schools making progress in this area. These schools were eliminated from the list. A total of 42 high schools and their feeder middle schools were invited to apply to become part of the project intended to impact all students, both disabled and nondisabled. Seven schools were chosen from three geographic areas around the state, one urban, one rural and one consortium of five high schools. Schools will receive six days of intensive training consists of drilling down data and identifying areas of need, as well as assistance in identifying evidenced based interventions to impact the overall number of students dropping out.

Technical assistance will be provided to seven Missouri schools (including one of the two large urban districts mentioned above) that have dropout rates above four percent for all students, both disabled and nondisabled. The NDPC-SD will assist schools in drilling down data and identifying areas of need, as well as assistance in identifying evidenced based interventions to impact the number of students who drop out.

See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. See indicator 1 for revisions to Improvement Activities.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Measurement:**

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	Percent of districts meeting AYP: 35% Participation rate for children with IEPs: 95% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 59.2% Math – 54.1%

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

At 99.6% the state met the 2008-09 target for indicator 3B (participation), but did not meet the targets for 3A (AYP) at 25.1% or 3C (proficiency) at 23.6% for Communication Arts and 25.8% for Mathematics. The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8. Prior to the 2008-09 school year, at the high school level, Communication Arts was assessed at grade 11 and Mathematics was assessed at grade 10. Science assessments occurred in grades 5, 8, and 11.

Beginning in 2008-09 the following required End of Course (EOC) assessments were administered at the secondary level in place of the MAP: Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Government will be administered as a required EOC assessment beginning in 2009-10.

Public reports of assessment data are available online at [http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school\\_data.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html).

**A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.**

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2009 were 59.2% for Communication Arts and 54.1% for Mathematics.

Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2006	Communication Arts	87	243	35.8%
	Mathematics	153	242	63.2%
	Combined – CA & Math	79	245	32.2%
2007	Communication Arts	32	233	13.7%
	Mathematics	69	230	30.0%
	Combined – CA & Math	25	235	10.6%
2008	Communication Arts	72	319	22.6%
	Mathematics	103	324	31.8%
	Combined – CA & Math	60	327	18.3%
2009	Communication Arts	121	331	36.6%
	Mathematics	114	327	34.9%
	Combined – CA & Math	84	334	<b>25.1%</b>

\* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes was 50 for 2006 and 2007, and 30 for 2008 and 2009.

**B. Participation rate for children with IEPs**

**MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities**

	Total Students with Disabilities	Regular MAP Assessment Participation	MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation	Participation Rate
2006 Communication Arts	71,345	67,255	3,613	99.3%
2006 Mathematics	73,074	68,928	3,627	99.3%
2007 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%
2007 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%
2008 Communication Arts	66,425	61,469	4,717	99.6%
2008 Mathematics	67,754	62,636	4,826	99.6%
<b>2009 Communication Arts</b>	67,124	61,629	5,264	<b>99.7%</b>
<b>2009 Mathematics</b>	66,179	60,680	5,251	<b>99.6%</b>

Source: State assessment data for all students with disabilities in all grade levels assessed, including students not enrolled for a full academic year. Participation Rate = ((Regular MAP Assessment Participation + MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation) / Total Students with Disabilities) x 100

**C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

“Proficiency” includes the top two of four achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

**MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities (includes only students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year)**

	2009 Total	2009 Proficient or Advanced	2009 Proficiency Rate
Communication Arts Total	66,904	15,778	23.6%
Mathematics Total	65,609	16,943	25.8%

Source: State Assessment (AYP) data

**MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities (Historical data includes all students with disabilities even if not enrolled for a full academic year)**

	2006 Proficiency Rate	2007 Proficiency Rate	2008 Proficiency Rate
Comm Arts Grade 3	22.9%	24.4%	25.8%
Comm Arts Grade 4	21.4%	23.6%	23.8%
Comm Arts Grade 5	18.3%	20.8%	23.3%
Comm Arts Grade 6	14.2%	16.2%	17.9%
Comm Arts Grade 7	11.8%	14.1%	15.9%
Comm Arts Grade 8	10.6%	11.3%	14.2%
Comm Arts Grade 11	9.8%	9.8%	8.7%
Comm Arts Total	15.9%	17.6%	19.1%
Mathematics Grade 3	28.8%	29.6%	30.3%
Mathematics Grade 4	25.2%	27.0%	27.8%
Mathematics Grade 5	20.8%	23.9%	24.0%
Mathematics Grade 6	17.5%	20.6%	23.1%
Mathematics Grade 7	14.0%	17.4%	20.5%
Mathematics Grade 8	12.9%	14.2%	16.0%
Mathematics Grade 10	10.3%	11.5%	14.8%
Mathematics Total	18.7%	20.9%	22.7%

Source: Table 6 of Section 618 Report to OSEP

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Indicator 3A increased in 2009, due to a larger number of districts meeting AYP for the IEP subgroup via Safe Harbor or Safe Harbor Confidence Interval provisions.

The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities. While the data source for this indicator changed, that made no difference to the

resulting data. Therefore, the state had a slight increase in the participation rate for communication arts and maintained the participation rate for mathematics.

The state did not meet the proficiency targets established for Indicator 3C for 2008-09 which are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students. Due to a change in the data source which excludes students who were not enrolled for a full academic year, progress/slippage from the previous year cannot be determined. The change in the data source was made per OSEP instructions for the APR.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans.
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Disseminate training on appropriate accommodation decisions and usage
- Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech pilot project which demonstrates the utility of text-to-speech and voice recognition (tts/vr) software to assist students with print disabilities achieve higher levels of performance on reading and writing tasks.
- State Personnel Development Grant/Work with a stakeholder group to develop and implement Missouri Integrated Model including essential elements from researched-based 3-tiered models

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation:** The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address poor performance. Districts completing improvement plans analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, address it through an objective and strategies.

In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan. See the APR overview for more information on the activities implemented by grant recipients.

The Division makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. These data, which include data on state assessments, are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance. Once districts are identified regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR overview. Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Consultants.

**Disseminate Training on Accommodations:** See APR overview. Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and usage are accomplished through the work of the regional Special Education Consultants described in the overview category labeled Consultants.

**eMINTS:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS)

**State Personnel Development Grant:** See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	A: 1.2% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates B: Not applicable

Actual Target Data for 2007-08:

Per OSEP’s instructions for the APR:

- 2007-08 data for 4A is being repeated in this report
- Reporting for 4B not required in this APR

With 0% districts identified with a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of 1.2% of districts identified for 2007-08.

Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was 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 / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation are considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines the calculations for 2007-08.

**Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Nondisabled for 2007-08**

	(A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD	(B) Count of Discipline Incidents for Non-disabled Students	(C) IEP Child Count Ages 3-22	(D) Total Enrollment less child count = Non-disabled	(E) Discipline Rate per 100 SWD	(F) Discipline Rate per 100 Non-disabled Students	(G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:Non-disabled
All Districts	5,035	15,024	138,306	778,908	3.64	1.93	1.89
Districts with 5 or more Incidents for Students with IEPs	4,734	13,347	101,512	568,959	4.66	2.35	1.99
Mean of Ratios							2.68
Standard Deviation of Ratios							1.70
Mean + 1 Standard Deviation							4.38

Calculations:

$E = (A / C) \times 100$  meaning, on average, there are 4.66 incidents per 100 students with disabilities for districts with five or more incidents for students with disabilities

$F = (B / D) \times 100$  meaning, on average, there are 2.35 incidents per 100 non-disabled students

$G = E / F$  meaning that the discipline rate for students with disabilities is 1.99 times that of nondisabled students

Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

Factors Determining Significant Discrepancies	Number of Districts
Districts with a 2007-08 ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation	16
Of these, the districts remaining after exclusion due to low discipline rates (Districts with an average number of incidents per 100 students less than 2.0 and 1.0, for disabled and nondisabled students, respectively)	15 (one removed due to low discipline rates)
Of these, the districts remaining with ratios greater than the mean + one standard deviation for two consecutive years (2006-07 and 2007-08)	0 (15 removed due to first year identification only)
Of these, the number remaining after data verification conducted	0
Number of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates	0
<b>Percent of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for 2007-08</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Definition of Significant Discrepancy:** As described in the table above, a district would be found to have a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates if the district has a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation (with adjustments for low discipline rates) for two consecutive years.

This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Per OSEP instructions for this APR, 2007-08 data for Indicator 4A is being repeated in this report, thus the state is unable to determine any progress or slippage from the previous year.

For the 2007-08 school year (based on 2006-07 and 2007-08 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. This resulted in the state meeting the target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Since no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, no districts were reviewed, and no noncompliance was identified for this indicator.

If districts had been identified, the review process would have included three basic components that address the requirement to review and, if appropriate require affected LEAs to revise their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior supports and procedural safeguards:

1. Monitoring staff review district policies and procedures related to discipline.
2. Monitoring staff conduct file reviews of students who had been long-term suspended or expelled to determine if districts are in compliance with respect to the discipline related requirements of IDEA. The indicators reviewed include such topics as provision of the procedural safeguard notice, as appropriate; conducting manifestation determination meetings; development of IEPs that document provision of services to students who are long term suspended or expelled; review/development of Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Behavior Assessments; consideration of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the IEP.
3. Monitoring staff conduct interviews of regular and special education staff to assess their level of understanding of procedures and practices in place within district buildings related to discipline of students with and without disabilities. For example, the file reviews demonstrate documentation in the IEP, but interviews shed more light on IEP implementation practices.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Embed district analysis of policies, procedures and practices as a part of the Self-Assessment for monitoring and the Model Program Evaluation materials
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Develop and implement use of demonstration sites for SW-PBS in order to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing rates of suspension and expulsion

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**District Self-Assessment:** In 2008, the IMACS system was revised to include a component to collect data for the discipline reviews. This system will be used beginning in 2009-2010 to implement the program evaluation regarding discipline that is discussed in the State Performance Plan. Subsequent improvement plans or corrective action plans will be managed through the system as well.

**Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation:** Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. Districts with one year of data that suggests discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, along with their RPDC Consultants, are notified. Any potential issues which might result in the district being determined to have significant discrepancies in the second year can then be identified and addressed.

Any districts determined to have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates based on two years of data are reviewed and, if necessary, required to develop an improvement plan and/or corrective action plan.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR overview Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources and Consultants.

**SW-PBS Demonstration Sites:** One hundred and thirty-three buildings were recognized and qualified as SW-PBS demonstration sites for 2008-09. This number increased from 35 in 2006-07 and 81 in 2007-08. For more information on schools serving as demonstration sites see APR overview under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

As noted in the revised Part B Indicator 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).

DESE Response:

Results of state's examination of data from FFY 2007 are included in the indicator description above. As no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, no LEAs were reviewed and thus no revision of policies, procedures and practices were required.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements

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

<p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day: 58.5% Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 10.4% Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.6%

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

At 9.8 percent, the state met the target for Indicator 5B. At 58 percent and 3.8 percent, the targets for Indicators 5A or 5C were not met.

**Special Education Placement Data for ages 6-21**

	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A)</b>	70,321	55.8%	70,011	57.1%	<b>68,222</b>	<b>58.0%</b>
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	34,316	27.2%	32,431	26.4%	30,335	25.8%
<b>Inside Regular Class &lt; 40% (5B)</b>	13,414	10.6%	12,279	10.0%	<b>11,522</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
Separate School	3,970	3.2%	3,856	3.1%	3,779	3.2%
Homebound/Hospital	655	0.5%	698	0.6%	690	0.6%
Residential Facility	7	0.0%	5	0.0%	1	0.0%
<b>Total Separate (5C)</b>	4,632	3.7%	4,559	3.7%	<b>4,470</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
Correctional Facilities	907	0.7%	1,051	0.9%	1,072	0.9%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,401	1.9%	2,332	1.9%	2,080	1.8%
Total School Age	125,991	100.0%	122,663	100.0%	117,701	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements via MOSIS Student Core. The count date for each year is December 1.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The data above indicate that the state did not meet the targets established for the 2008-09 school year for Inside Regular Class  $\geq 80\%$  (5A) or separate settings (5C). The state met the 2008-09 target for Inside Regular Class  $< 40\%$  (5B). While the target for 5A was not met, the percent of students in this category increased from 2007-08.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Identify, encourage and support demonstration sites for co-teaching, inclusion, differentiated instruction, three-tiered model systems change (e.g. PBS and RTI)
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Collaborate with other department initiatives to promote co-teaching, inclusion and differentiated instruction i.e. Teaching and Learning Conference, Professional Learning Communities, Reading First, High Schools that Work, etc.
- State Personnel Development Grant/Work with a stakeholder group to develop and implement Missouri Integrated Model including essential elements from researched-based 3-tiered models
- Revise co-teaching module to adopt Marilyn Friend strategies and training materials. Adapt the face-to-face training for web-based delivery
- Disseminate training on standards-based IEPs

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Demonstration Sites:** One hundred and thirty-three buildings were recognized and qualified as SW-PBS demonstration sites for 2008-09. This number increased from 35 in 2006-07 and 81 in 2007-08. For more information on schools serving as demonstration sites see APR overview under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network.

Missouri has invested considerable resources in laying groundwork for the statewide scaling up of RtI. One of the goals of the work with the National Center on Response to Intervention is to develop a selection and evaluation process to establish RtI demonstration sites. A response to intervention webpage available through both the DESE General Education and Special Education websites offers information about RtI demonstration sites.

**Targeted Technical Assistance:** The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies.

The Division makes data on educational environments by district and region available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on an annual basis. These data are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions that are in danger of not meeting the targets for each of the sub indicators, indicating needed training and/or technical assistance.

RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the DESE-supported Co-teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend was revised in 07-08 and is continuing to be disseminated by the RPDC Consultants. Division staff is working with e-Learning for Educators to make LRE training modules accessible via the web.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-based Practices:** See APR overview under the categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Response to Intervention.

The Division collaborated with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two part RtI overview available online and in DVD format and provided for an opportunity for “ask the expert” questions from the field. The overview is available at [http://dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars\\_presentations.html](http://dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars_presentations.html).

Additionally the Department across divisions promoted three-tiered models of intervention by showcasing successful school districts at several state-wide conferences sponsored by various stakeholders (school boards association, superintendents’ organization, general education and special education administrators and teachers).

**Collaborate with other department initiatives:** Collaboration has continued between department initiatives in the form of planning and working with districts to begin implementation of Missouri Integrated Model design. See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri Integrated Model.

The Division of Special Education has also collaborated by contributing funding to support regional consultants who provide assistance implementing Professional Learning Communities.

DESE is also working with the National Center on Response to Intervention to scale-up the use of RtI in the state. See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention for more information.

**State Personnel Development Grant:** See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.

**eMints:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri’s Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS)

**Co-Teaching:** On Feb 6-7, 2008, Division staff attended a Co-Teaching workshop conducted by Dr. Marilyn Friend and hosted by the St. Louis RPDC. The workshop centered on the characteristics of positive co-teaching environments and the steps used in creating supportive educational philosophy among administrators, co-teaching teams, and co-workers in buildings and districts. Dr. Marilyn Friend’s Co-Teaching materials have been adopted as a learning module by the RPDC Consultants. A DVD on co-teaching was also produced and provided to the RPDCs to use in trainings. Regional consultants continue to provide Co-teaching trainings across the state.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

#### **MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Measurement:**

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	Not applicable due to data collection change. See the Missouri SPP.

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Per OSEP instructions, due to federal data collection changes, states need not report on this indicator for the 2008-09 school year. New baseline data and targets will need to be established in the future.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not applicable

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

Not applicable

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
All Years	Established in February 2010 update of the SPP

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

DESE Response:

Baseline data, targets and improvement activities are provided in the February 2010 update to the SPP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 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.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	75.0% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri, at 69.6% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, did not meet the target established for the 2008-09 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 523 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. MSIP reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 523 districts as well as other responsible public agencies. These reviews include the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys are used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys are sent to all parents in the approximately 100 school districts undergoing MSIP reviews each year.

**Survey Instrument:** The complete MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf>.

The MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire contains two items directly related to this indicator:

- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement.
- The school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with this SPP indicator.

The table below shows the rates of agreement with both items for parents of students with disabilities. Results from all respondents and results from a derived representative sample are provided.

The parent survey asks for demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others.

The University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from Advance Questionnaire data. The model is based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian; Majority=White). The first step determines the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divides them into three groups. The second step determines the overall student enrollments, as well as

the Minority/Majority enrollments at the state level, within each of the above FRL categories. This produces a stratified sampling scheme at the state level which contains six cells:

FRL	Minority	Majority
Less Than 33%	cell 1	cell 2
33% to 54%	cell 3	cell 4
55% or More	cell 5	cell 6

**Valid and reliable data:** A sample of 2,001 Special Education parents was drawn using the above sampling scheme. The results from the sample were slightly less than the results from all respondents shown below (71.2% for sample and 72.3% for all respondents). The differences in the percents in agreement are not significant, thereby establishing the reliability of the data. The validity of the data is ensured through use of the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire, which has been determined by OSEDA to be a valid instrument for gathering data from parents.

**Results of Parent Survey 2008-09**

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2008-09 Parents of Students with Disabilities	5,103 (69.6%)	2,234 (30.4%)	7,337 (100.0%)
2007-08 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006-07 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state did not meet the target established for the 2008-09 school year.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Determine methodology/criteria and identify districts with good parental involvement. Provide incentive for districts to serve as model districts.
- Develop five questions for voluntary district use on the MSIP Parent AQ
- Make NCSEAM parent survey available to districts for voluntary use. Consider requiring the use of the survey if district’s MSIP AQ data below target, to assist district in improvement planning efforts.
- Collaborate with MPACT to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Identification of parent involvement models:** This past year the Division worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to research successful models of Parent Involvement and investigate what others states might already have in place in this area. This information is being compiled and reviewed. Results from this information gathering process will be used during the coming months to develop criteria and ultimately identify districts to use as Models of Success. This information is also being used in the evaluation and revision of our Improvement Activities for this indicator. The Division has also been collecting information from the 14 pilot schools/districts that participate in the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) integrated model (MIM) project. Parent and Community Involvement is one of the eleven essential elements in this model and all of the 14 districts have been developing and implementing research-based parent involvement activities as part of their MIM activities.

**MSIP Parent AQ:** Division staff are reviewing the NCSEAM Parent Survey and identifying five questions from that survey to include on the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Advanced Parent Questionnaire (AQ). Staff are working with MSIP personnel to identify the additional questions and have them ready to include on the Parent AQ for the fifth cycle of MSIP reviews which will begin in the 2011-12 school year.

**NCSEAM Parent Survey:** The Division has made the survey available to districts for voluntary use through the Division listserv (SELS). Districts scoring below the target on this indicator are informed of the NCSEAM survey as a resource to use in assessing parent perceptions of the district's efforts toward involving parents of students with disabilities.

**Collaboration with MPACT:** MPACT collaborated with the First Steps (Part C) Area Directors to develop and provide one parent training in each First Steps region for parents of both First Steps and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) children on Part C to Part B transition. MPACT provided training in six regions with a total of 48 parents, 16 teachers and 28 additional participants.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 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.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

The state met the 2008-09 target of 0% of districts (0/556 districts = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state’s identification method 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 working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts 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 district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

**Criteria/Definition of “Disproportionate Representation”**

Risk Ratio	Cell size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 0.25 for under representation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 in racial/ethnic group</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)</li> </ul>

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for two consecutive years and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of districts with Disproportional Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2008-09 identification using data from 2007-08 & 2008-09	0 districts under and 0 districts over in any race/ethnicity category	0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 556 LEAs.

If districts had been identified, the review process would consist of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

Any individual student non-compliance identified during the reviews must be corrected, even if the review does not result in a finding of noncompliance based on inappropriate identification.

As indicated in the table above, in 2008-09 no districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2007-08 and 2008-09, therefore no reviews were conducted resulting in no districts with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

**0% of districts (0 / 556 = 0%)** in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation. See Indicator 10 for information on the review process directed towards specific disability categories.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state met the 2008-09 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of noncompliance:** There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2007-08; therefore no correction was required.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Review/revise existing procedures for identification of districts and the review of district procedures, policies and practices
- Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation
- Implement revised review process
- Identify and disseminate training and technical assistance resources
- Provide support for districts identified with inappropriate identification through state or national conferences

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Review/revise existing procedures:** During 2007-08, the Division of Special Education revised the process for identifying districts with disproportionate representation and the process for reviewing the procedures, policies and practices of those districts in order to determine if there is inappropriate identification of students with disabilities by racial/ethnic groups. The method for identifying districts is described above and in the SPP. The review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. The procedures were reviewed in 2008-09 and no changes were necessary.

**Provide training and information on identification and review process to districts:** The initial identification is based on the Special Education child count and district enrollment data. Information on the identification and review process of districts is included in various trainings regarding Special Education data and compliance such as New Directors of Special Education Institute, Special Education Administrators Conference, webinars, and Special Education monitoring training. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are assigned a special education staff supervisor to assist them with the monitoring process.

**Implement revised review process:** No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation, therefore, no reviews were conducted.

**Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources:** See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

**Support for identified districts:** No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 10:** 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))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

The state met the 2008-09 target of 0% of districts (0/556 districts = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See information in APR Indicator 9 for a description of the methodology used to identify and review districts with disproportionate representation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under and over representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

**Criteria/Definition of “Disproportionate Representation”**

<b>Risk Ratio</b>	<b>Cell size</b>
Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation  OR  Less than 0.25 for under representation	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group  AND  At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for 2008-09 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation for each disability category. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)</b>	<b>Number of districts with Disproportional Representation as a result of inappropriate identification</b>
2008-09 identification using data from 2007-08 & 2008-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLD: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Autism: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Sp/Lang: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• ED: 2 districts with overrepresentation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• MR: 5 districts with overrepresentation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• OHI: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLD: 0</li> <li>• Autism: 0</li> <li>• Sp/Lang: 0</li> <li>• ED: 0</li> <li>• MR: 0</li> <li>• OHI: 0</li> </ul>

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 556 LEAs.

Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR), and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2008-09, seven districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2007-08 and 2008-09, two in the area of Emotional Disturbance and five in the area of Mental Retardation, all cases of overrepresentation. Previous reviews for six of the seven districts revealed that the disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification. A review of the seventh district, conducted in fall 2009, revealed that the disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification.

The review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group

that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

**0% of districts (0 / 556 = 0%)** in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of Previous Noncompliance:** No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2007-08, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state met the 2008-09 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Indicator 11:** 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))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of children will be evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 97.8% of the time.

The State of Missouri uses the 60 day timeline for completion of initial evaluations which is the same as the federal timeline; however Missouri regulations allow for an extension of the timeline if there are exceptional circumstances such as delays due to family or child illness or school delays due to inclement weather or extended school breaks.

The State Regulations (Regulation III – Identification and Evaluation Page 32-33.

[http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc\\_By\\_Ref\\_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf](http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf)) include the following language regarding initial evaluation timelines:

*Evaluation Timelines*

*The public agency shall provide the parent with a Notice of Intent to Evaluate as soon as possible, but within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of referral for evaluation. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause (school breaks for summer or holidays, student illness, etc.) and documented in the student's record.*

*The evaluation shall be completed and a decision regarding eligibility rendered within sixty (60) calendar days following parent consent or notice, as the case may be. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause and documented in the student's record.*

*Initial Evaluation (34 CFR 300.301)*

*Each public agency shall conduct a full and individual initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR 300.305 and 34 CFR 300.306, before the initial provision of special education and related services to a child with a disability. This may or may not include additional testing as determined by the evaluation team members.*

*Either a parent of a child or a public agency may initiate a request for an initial evaluation to determine if the child is a child with a disability.*

*The initial evaluation must be conducted within sixty (60) days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation, may be extended for just cause, and must consist of procedures to determine if the child is a child with a disability as defined in this State Plan and to determine the educational needs of the child.*

*If a parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation or, if a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the evaluation timeline has begun and prior to the determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability, the sixty (60) day timeframe does not apply. An exception to this applies only if the subsequent public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and the subsequent public agency agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.*

*The screening of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation shall not be considered to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services.*

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

These data were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- 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 was completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned DESE staff.

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

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

Delays were considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions were not acceptable or if the districts failed to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Year	Number with consent to evaluate	Number within 60 day timeline	Number > 60 days with acceptable reason	Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2008-09 Total	3,728 (a)	3,340	307	3,647 (b)	97.8%

Calculation = (b / a) x 100 where a=the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received; b=the number whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason.

Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 123 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2008-09. A total of 118 of the 123 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.

Year	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.7%	94.0%	97.1%	97.8%

The number of days past the 60 day timeline ranged from one day to 102 days, with two-thirds of the delays due to acceptable reasons. Approximately 80% of the delays were 20 days or less with 57% of the delays 10 days or less and 37% of the delays 5 days or less. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable were due to lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks or due to the inability of the district to provide an acceptable explanation for the entire delay.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Four districts had findings of noncompliance issued in 2007-08. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all four districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that, in addition to the four findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

While not meeting the target of 100%, the comparison for school years 2007-08 to 2008-09 shows an increase from 97.1% to 97.8% within acceptable timelines.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance and training to determine causes of delayed evaluations and to determine strategies to resolve failure to meet timelines:
  - Identify districts with systemic non-compliance on timelines annually.
  - Notify RPDC compliance consultants of those districts annually.
  - RPDC compliance consultants work with the identified districts to assist in the correction of non-compliance
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines. The topic will be addressed in the following ways:
  - Self assessment training
  - Special Education Administrators Conference
  - New Director’s Training
  - Web stream Presentations
  - Technical Assistance through RPDC consultants and DESE Special Education Staff

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Targeted technical assistance:** State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Division of Special Education Compliance supervisors to target the districts who needed assistance in meeting the 60 day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of 60 day timelines. Upon notification, the RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they developed strategies to correct the non-compliance.

**Ongoing training and technical assistance:** Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies completing the evaluation process within 60 calendar days. Acceptable reasons for an extension to the 60 day timelines are reviewed during the self-assessment training also.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding the 60 day timeline for evaluation, compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the Annual New Director's Training.

The Division of Special Education website has web stream presentations that provide training on the 60 day timeline requirement. Finally, listserv messages by numerous Division staff and webinar presentations by the Assistant Commissioner of Special Education remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

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).

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.

DESE Response:

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 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.

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

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to 637(a)(9)(A)) for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

With 91.3% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2008-09, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, but showed improvement over the previous year.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of C to B transition timelines, districts, as part of a self-assessment for special education monitoring, were required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

Data for 2008-09 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (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 initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- 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.

Reasons given for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Late referral from Part C
- Parent/child unavailability, holidays and child illness
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

For the purpose of this indicator the only acceptable reason for exceeding the timeline was failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner.

**Part C to Part B Referrals**

	2008-09
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B	156
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible	17
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays (124 children) and eligible children for whom parents did not give consent to evaluate in a timely manner but the IEP was implemented within required timelines after receiving parental consent (2 children)	126
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation of initial services	0
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	1
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday	12
Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible) = c / (a-b-d-e)	<b>91.3%</b>

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 123 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2008-09. A total of 48 of the 123 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Percent within acceptable timelines	80.3%	88.6%	91.3%

Of the 12 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, all but one had the IEP in place within one month of turning three. The remaining child had an IEP in place within four months of the third birthday, with most of the delay due to lack of parent response to phone calls. Most of the delays were due to the inability to contact the family and/or scheduling difficulties.

The districts found out of compliance with this indicator will be required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** One district had findings of noncompliance issued in 2007-08. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that, in addition to the one finding of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The comparison of school years 2006-07 through 2008-09 shows a significant increase from 80.3% to 91.3% within acceptable timelines. Nevertheless, the 100% target was not met and, as indicated in the improvement activities for this indicator, technical assistance is being provided to districts regarding compliance in the area of Part C to Part B transition.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts who received Corrective Action Plans related to C to B Transition
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all districts to increase compliance in the area of C to B transition timelines. The topic will be addressed in the following ways:
  - Self assessment training
  - Special Education Administrators Conference
  - New Director's Training
  - Web stream Presentations
  - DESE listserv message and/or webinar presentations

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Targeted technical assistance:** Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants work with Division of Special Education supervisors to target the districts who need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notify RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC consultants assisted districts in determining the reasons for the delays and developing strategies to correct the non-compliance.

**Ongoing training and technical assistance:** Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies' knowledge regarding students referred by Part C to B transition.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding students referred by Part C and having an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, a compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the New Director's Training.

The Division of Special Education provides an online training module on C to B transition. Finally, listserv messages by Division staff and webinar presentations by Assistant Commissioner, Heidi Atkins Lieberman, remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

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).

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.

DESE Response:

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Measurement:** 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Per APR instruction, actual target data for 2008-09 will not be presented in this APR.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Thirty-eight districts had findings of noncompliance issued in 2007-08. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all districts but one were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that, in addition to the findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

The remaining district has since been cleared of noncompliance. The desk review of transition files for this district showed no evidence of the administration of transition assessments. Therefore, noncompliance was identified. The district submitted a Corrective Action plan which was approved, but when documentation of correction was submitted in early summer 2008, there was still no evidence of the administration of transition assessments. During the summer, DESE compliance staff discussed what needed to be done with the district’s administration. As soon as students returned in the fall, transition assessments were administered and IEPs were amended in order to correct the remaining noncompliant indicator.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not applicable for 2008-09 APR.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:****OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:**

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).

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.

**DESE Response:**

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification with the exception of one district which has since been corrected and verified.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	NA

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Per OSEP instructions, reporting for this indicator is not required for this APR.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not applicable for 2008-09 APR.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 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.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri had timely correction of noncompliance in 99.9% of cases with only one indicator for one district exceeding the 12 month timeline for correction of noncompliance. The remaining district has since been cleared of noncompliance. The desk review of transition files for this district showed no evidence of the administration of transition assessments. Therefore, noncompliance was identified. The district submitted a Corrective Action plan which was approved, but when documentation of correction was submitted in early summer 2008, there was still no evidence of the administration of transition assessments. During the summer, DESE compliance staff discussed what needed to be done with the district’s administration. As soon as students returned in the fall, transition assessments were administered and IEPs were amended in order to correct the remaining noncompliant indicator.

As a result of this occurrence, DESE strongly encourages districts to submit all documentation at least three months prior to the end of the 12-month timeline. The Compliance Supervisors and RPDC Consultants receive monthly updates of districts still in CAP status and the indicators that remain out of compliance. Through phone calls and hands-on assistance, the districts are reminded often of the requirement for correction of all noncompliance within the 12-month timeframe.

A total of 104 districts and 2 charter schools had monitoring reports issued during 2007-08, resulting in a total of 106 responsible public agencies. The Special Education monitoring follows the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district is reviewed once within the five year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Focus on State Performance Plan Indicators. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # of LEAs issued findings in 2007-08 – the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2007-08
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2007-08 – the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies

reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area

- # of Findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
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.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings		0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities:	22	58	58
4A. Percent of districts identified 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.	Dispute Resolution:		9	9
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities:	4	8	8
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.	Dispute Resolution:		1	1
9. Percent of districts with	Monitoring Activities:	25	85	85
	Dispute Resolution:		3	3
	Monitoring Activities:	53	371	371
	Dispute Resolution:		5	5
	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.  10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution:		0	0
11. 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.	Monitoring Activities:	48	237	237
	Dispute Resolution:		2	2
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.	Monitoring Activities:	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution:		0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities:	38	98	97
	Dispute Resolution:		0	0
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			878	877
<b>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.</b>			<b>(b) / (a) X 100 =</b>	99.9%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Missouri had 99.9 % of noncompliance identified in 2007-08 that was timely corrected and verified within one year of the notification. Only one indicator for one district was not corrected within 12 months. The compliance supervisor and district’s RPDC consultant were in frequent contact with that district until the correction of noncompliance was completed and verified.

**Correction of noncompliance from previous APR:** As reported in the last APR, 100% of findings of noncompliance from 2006-2007 were timely corrected and verified within one year of notification, including correction of all individual noncompliance. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification in 100% of the files reviewed. Failure to evidence 100% correction within 12 months is not considered “timely correction.” The state also verified that, in addition to the findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system that
  - Identifies procedural noncompliance
  - Corrects identified noncompliance in a timely manner
  - Focuses on performance of students with disabilities
  - Includes a system of rewards and sanctions
- Implement targeted technical assistance that will enable districts to
  - Effectively and efficiently meet compliance requirements
  - Progress toward meeting the targets for student performance in the SPP
- Implement a regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans
- Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes
- Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews to ensure that they are completed in a timely manner.
- Generate and review monthly reports of districts with remaining noncompliance in order to implement activities to correct the noncompliance within 12 months.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system:** As the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) prepared to enter into a new Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) five year monitoring cycle, which began in 2006-07, the Division of Special Education worked closely with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and several groups of stakeholders on focused monitoring procedures. As described in the APR Overview, the procedures focus strongly on the SPP performance areas by establishing criteria for Graduation and Dropout Rates, Performance on Statewide Assessments and LRE. Districts not meeting the established criteria are required to complete both a self-assessment file review using related compliance indicators and an improvement plan related to those performance areas. Results of the self assessment (file review) are verified through a Division of Special Education desk review, and Improvement Plans are also reviewed using a scoring guide developed with the assistance of the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC). See the APR overview for a description of focused monitoring on-site reviews in 4<sup>th</sup> cycle. This monitoring system rewards districts that are demonstrating solid performance in key SPP areas.

In addition to the focused file review, we require a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, we collect data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitor for compliance in these areas. Corrective Action Plans are required for any identified non-compliance, and this must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web based monitoring system (IMACS) and more frequent contact by RPDC consultants and DESE supervisors. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken when they attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of non-compliance. Districts must also correct findings of non-compliance on an individual child basis, and follow up procedures are in place to monitor this as well.

The monitoring/general supervision system is also closely linked with the Department's MSIP process, which is tied to district accreditation. Results of special education monitoring, including results of data reviews and improvement planning, are hi-lighted in the district's MSIP report. This is important, because the MSIP report receives a high level of attention from the district, the local board of education and the community.

**Implement targeted technical assistance:** Many strategies are in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance within 12 months. Emphasis is placed upon ensuring that DESE compliance supervisors have a heightened awareness of the districts that have need of technical assistance in order to correct non-compliance. An agenda item in regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors addresses districts that are out of compliance, and the progress being made with those districts to correct their non-compliance. When a

supervisor encounters difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance consultant assigned to the district is contacted and asked to make a personal visit to the district to provide assistance.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Monitoring training and other state-wide conferences such as the Special Education Administrator's Conference emphasis is placed upon state targets to ensure districts that are preparing for their MSIP review understand the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Fourth Cycle Monitoring training maintains its focus upon the importance of correction of non-compliance.

**Implement a regional support system:** DESE has five regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants work with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on compliance standards and indicators to all districts. Each district with identified noncompliance is assigned to a compliance consultant who assists the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report.

Communication between compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants provides a strong base for the regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans. Updates about the status of districts' correction of non-compliance are provided to RPDC consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. This ongoing communication results in timely correction of non-compliance.

**Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes:** The IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor the districts' evidence of correction of non-compliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction to compliance supervisors. Regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors and weekly phone calls with the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. Staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of non-compliance.

**Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews:** The assistant director and data specialist of the Compliance section work closely to communicate to compliance supervisors when district timelines are approaching for correction of non-compliance in 12 months. This diligence has resulted in an extremely high level of correction of non-compliance within 12 months in our state. The system we have put in place has been successful and we plan to continue this coordination of follow-up reviews.

**Generate and review monthly reports of districts:** The compliance data specialist generates regular data reports to track correction of non-compliance. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months such as phone calls, letters and other contacts with district administration. These actions ensure that the corrections are made and verified within one year of notification. Staff find the generation of data reports to track correction of non-compliance effective and will continue to use these reports for that purpose.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

#### **MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of 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.

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.

In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

DESE Response:

As stated above all noncompliance was corrected and verified within one year with the exception of one district relating to Indicator 13. Correction of noncompliance for Indicators 11, 12, and 13 was addressed under those indicators. The state used the Indicator 15 worksheet to provide the data for this indicator. The worksheet is replicated in this document.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri met the target of 100% of complaints resolved within 60 days or appropriately extended timelines.

**Child Complaints**

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Within 60 Days	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60 days or extended timelines
2005-06	104	92	76	16	0	100.0%
2006-07	99	81	75	6	0	100.0%
2007-08	77	63	57	6	0	100.0%
2008-09	92	72	69	3	0	<b>100.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Review and revise, as necessary, the complaint system web training

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

**Maintain compliance with timelines:** DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

**Complaint System Web Training:** In September 2007, the division staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints. A review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 17:** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Three due process hearings were filed and fully adjudicated during 08-09. Of those three, one hearing was not fully adjudicated within timelines and timelines were not properly extended. Following contractual provisions for Hearing Chairs, liquidated damages in the amount of \$6,200 were assessed against the Hearing Chair and this was noted in the chairperson’s file to be considered when contracts are renewed.

**Due Process Hearing Requests**

Year	Fully Adjudicated Hearings (by June 30)	Fully Adjudicated Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2005-06	2	0	100.0%
2006-07	3	0	100.0%
2007-08	1	0	100.0%
2008-09	3	1	<b>66.7%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

At 66.7%, the State did not meet the target of 100%. As stated above, three due process hearing requests were filed and fully adjudicated during 08-09. One of those hearings exceeded the timelines and was not properly extended, resulting in slippage for this indicator. Sanctions were imposed against the hearing chair in accordance with contractual provisions in the form of liquidated damages and this hearing officer’s contract was not renewed.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Review and revise, as necessary, the complaint system web training

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

**Maintain compliance with timelines:** DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for completion of fully adjudicated due process hearings. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

**Complaint System Web Training:** In September 2007, the division staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for due process hearings. A review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 18:** 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))

**Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	35.1% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri met the target of 35.1% established for the 2008-09 school year.

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41	25
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20	11
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	48.8%	<b>44.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The data for 2008-09 indicates a slight decrease from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. The state met the target for this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue to collaborate with PTI to disseminate training and technical assistance for parents and LEAs regarding resolution sessions

Discussion of this improvement activity follows:

An updated Parent’s Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and division staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and is posted on the division website.

A web based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system was completed in September 2007. The training includes a description of the due process system, including resolution sessions. A review of this training indicated no need for revisions at this time.

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent’s Act [MPACT]) provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions.

The Division of Special Education uses its special education listserv (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards and our web-based training.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	35.1% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2008-09:

Missouri met the 2008-09 target with 81.3% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%
2007-08	11	17	64.7%
2008-09	13	16	<b>81.3%</b>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:

With 81.3% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.1% for 2008-09.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue to collaborate with PTI to disseminate training and technical assistance for parents and LEAs regarding mediations

Discussion of the improvement activity follows:

An updated Parent’s Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and division staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination to parents. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and is posted on the division website.

A web based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system was completed in September 2007. The training includes a description of the due process system, including resolution sessions. A review of this training indicated no need for revisions at this time.

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent’s Act [MPACT]) provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions.

The Division of Special Education uses its special education listserv (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards and our web-based training.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 20:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

**Measurement:**

State reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Report data, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year

States are required to use the “Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri’s score of 100% met the target for the requirement to submit timely and accurate data.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- MOSIS – Missouri Student Information System is a newly implemented student level collection system for the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. MOSIS is taking the previous Core Data Collection system to the student level. The data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, placement, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. These data are also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14. MOSIS includes a variety of data edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy of data
- Core Data Collection System – Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. Most of the collections for student data are now being populated with data from the MOSIS system. The collections populated with MOSIS data continue to utilize edit checking logic as a second screening of the data
- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) – MAP data are used by the Department for NCLB/AYP reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data are used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3
- IMACS – the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Transition Plans (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15)
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to

## APR – Part B

## Missouri

monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 15-19

- Other - The data collections for Early Childhood Outcomes (APR 7) and Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2008-09. The results are below:

<b>SPP/APR Data – Indicator 20</b>			
<b>APR Indicator</b>	<b>Valid and Reliable</b>	<b>Correct Calculation</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	1	NA	1
2	1	NA	1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	NA	NA	0
14	NA	NA	0
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> – If the FFY 2007 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		<b>5</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b> – Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		<b>39.00</b>

618 Data – Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/10	1	NA	NA	NA	1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	21
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total (Subtotal x 1.857)</b>		39.00

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	39.00
B. 618 Grand Total	39.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	78.00
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	78.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	<b>100.00%</b>

As indicated above, state reported data for 2008-09 were submitted in a timely fashion and were accurate as defined by OSEP’s scoring rubric.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2008-09.

The Division continues with data verification efforts as described in the SPP.

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the new MOSIS collection system which populated the web-based Core Data Collection System. A manual with reporting instructions, and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and Core Data systems. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Division staff. The end-of-year collections for 2007-08 were the first special education collections to be collected solely through MOSIS. Throughout 2008-09, Division staff worked extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level
- Data editing and validation are handled by Division staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts

- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are now also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting
- Staff in the Division serve as active members of the Department’s Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various DESE programs are met
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data
- Data gathered through IMACS all undergo verification by Compliance Supervisors, and the Supervisors’ determinations supersede district responses if different

These efforts have allowed the Division to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, most errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue involvement with development of Missouri’s Student Information System (MOSIS)
- Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use
- Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment
- Increase involvement in work with Center for Data Quality (C4DQ)

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Missouri’s Student Information System (MOSIS):** As noted above, the DESE and Division have fully implemented a student level data collection. Division staff is part of a DESE workgroup that identified and defined the necessary data elements. The Division staff has worked closely with other DESE staff to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent. Extensive technical assistance to districts ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

**Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use:** While discussions specific to this topic have not been held, the topic is embedded in most trainings and conversations that involve the special education system of general supervision. District and DESE personnel are aware that data are being used to trigger requirements for self-assessment purposes, select districts for on-site reviews, report to the public and provide local Determinations to districts, among other things. All of these endeavors have emphasized the importance of data accuracy.

**Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment:** See the APR Overview regarding Improvement Planning. The first step in the improvement planning process is a data-based needs assessment. The training for the improvement plan includes information and examples of a quality needs assessment. The training stresses that accurate data is the basis for a quality needs assessment, and that utilizing data to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses will, at times, result in uncovering inaccurate data. Therefore, training districts to conduct data-based needs assessments will result in more accurate data. In addition, the scoring guide for the improvement plans provides points for the following:

- Methodology of drilldown process and data sources used are appropriate and described in sufficient detail
- Hypothesized root causes in needed areas of improvement are identified through data analysis
- The needs of the district are identified and prioritized through data analysis

**Center for Data Quality (C4DQ) Involvement:** The basic purpose of the involvement with C4DQ is to make more information available to districts regarding the accuracy of data submitted to the DESE. Involvement with C4DQ has been minimal during 2008-09, due to the implementation of the student level data collections through MOSIS. MOSIS has focused on facilitating the submission of data by the

districts as well as up-front edit checks to screen the data prior to it being certified by the districts. Due to the extensive edits for the student level data collection, this improvement activity is no longer necessary.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. Improvement Activities have been revised in the SPP. Revisions to improvement activities were made as a result of an evaluation process to ensure alignment with all Division and Department activities and to ensure that the activities were measurable. These changes were presented to and approved by the SEAP in December 2009.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

DESE Response:

The state used the Indicator 20 Data Rubric to provide the data for this indicator. The rubric is replicated in this document.