Missouri Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 75%. The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.9%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way the data were reported. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 4.3%. The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator. The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.
3. Participation and performance of	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP	OSEP looks forward to the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]	accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 25.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 18.35%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 35.0%.	State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.
3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.7% for reading and 99.6% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95.0%. The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 23.6% for reading and 25.8% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 59.2% for reading and 54.1% for math. The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. Because the	OSEP appreciates the State's

<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</th><th>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</th><th>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</th></tr>
<tr><td>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

[Results Indicator]</td><td>State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there was progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.2%.

The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</td><td>efforts to improve performance.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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.

[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</td><td>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</td><td>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</td></tr>
<tr><td>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; or
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>The State revised the indicator language and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State's reported data for this indicator are:
<table><tr><th></th><th>FFY 2007 Data</th><th>FFY 2008 Data</th><th>FFY 2008 Target</th><th>Progress</th></tr></table></td><td>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</td></tr>
</table>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day: 57.08 / 58 / 58.5 / 0.92% B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day: 10.01 / 9.8 / 10.4 / 0.21% C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements: 3.72 / 3.8 / 3.6 / -0.08% These data represent progress for 5A and 5B. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5B but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5C.	
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. [Results Indicator; New]	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.	The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.
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	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for this indicator. OSEP notes that the State's FFY 2010 end targets for this indicator do not reflect improvement over the FFY 2008 reported baseline data. The State provided an explanation for end	The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR. The State must revise its FFY 2010 targets to show

<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</th><th>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</th><th>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</th></tr>
<tr><td>and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>targets that do not reflect improvement for this specific indicator.

The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:
<table>
<tr><th>08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th><th><u>Summary Statement 1</u>[1]</th><th><u>Summary Statement 2</u>[2]</th></tr>
<tr><td>Outcome A:
Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td><td>92.6</td><td>55.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Outcome B:
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td><td>93.7</td><td>42.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Outcome C:
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td><td>90.6</td><td>60.6</td></tr>
</table></td><td>improvement over the baseline.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 69.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 72.33%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target for this indicator of 75%.

In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</td><td>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education</td><td>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data</td><td>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</td></tr>
</table>

[1] 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 six years of age or exited the program.
[2] Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.	OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%. The State explained that it is using a State-established timeline for initial evaluations and provided a citation to its State regulations on extensions of time. The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, 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). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
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.	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 91.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 88.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100%

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.	compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator. The State reported that 37 of 38 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining one finding subsequently was corrected by Fall 2009.	In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.
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.	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.	In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results 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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.9%. The State's FFY 2007 data were 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%. The State reported that 877 of 878 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining one finding subsequently was corrected by fall 2009. The State reported during OSEP's Verification Visit to the State on September 28, 2009 that it did not have a process in place to ensure that noncompliance identified as the result of due process hearings is corrected. Although the State reported in its FFY 2007 APR that it issued one due process complaint decision in FFY 2007, it is not clear whether the State included in its Indicator 15 Worksheet any findings that were the result of the one due process hearing.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP Memo 09-02. In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet. In responding to Indicators 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators. As stated in OSEP's February 18, 2010 verification visit letter, the State was required to: (1) submit an assurance that it has finalized and is implementing its new procedures for ensuring correction of noncompliance identified through hearing officer decisions and tracking correction of any noncompliance identified through hearing officer decisions; and (2) clarify how the State ensures that the files selected by local educational agencies to demonstrate correction of noncompliance are representative of all student files with prior noncompliance as required under 34 CFR §300.149. The State provided this assurance and clarification in its April 8, 2010 letter to OSEP.
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a	The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 66.66%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 44.0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 48.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 35.1%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 81.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 64.7%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 35.1%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.