STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

MISSOURI PART B

2005-2006 through 2012-2013

Updated February 1, 2011

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: 1

Indicator 1 – Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma 6

Indicator 2 – Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school 11

Indicator 3 – Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 13

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: 19

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 aged 3 through 5 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. 34

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 38

Indicator 10 – Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification 42

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. 45

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. 47

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. 49

Indicator 14 – Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: 52

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. 56

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. 61

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. 63

Indicator 18 – Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. 65

Indicator 19 – Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements 67

Indicator 20 – State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 69

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

<u>The following is repeated from the SPP submitted December 1, 2005</u>

During the August 18-19, 2005, meeting of Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), staff from the Office of Special Education of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), along with personnel from the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) presented on the requirements of the new State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Reports (APR), in context of the history of improvement planning in the state. The SEAP is a statewide stakeholder group made up of parents of students with disabilities, general and special educators, administrators and other service providers. The SEAP has served as the steering committee for previous self-assessment and improvement planning processes and APRs. It was agreed that the Office of Special Education would develop preliminary targets and improvement activities that would then be presented regionally across the state in order to gain public input for the Plan.

In proposing targets for the next six years, the Office of Special Education gathered data on the indicators which require targets and looked at three to five years of historical data for students with disabilities and compared that to data for all students where applicable. Logarithmic trends were then applied to the historical data. A logarithmic trend line is a best-fit curve that is used when the rate of change in the data increases or decreases quickly and then levels out as is the case with many types of performance data. Along with the historical and projected trend data, DESE considered other pertinent information, including compliance requirements and evidence-based practices that have already been implemented at the state or local levels. In proposing improvement activities, the Office of Special Education primarily referred to the Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2003-04 which included future activities, many of which had been developed through the state's improvement planning process.

The Office of Special Education created a presentation in order to gain public input on the proposed targets and improvement activities. Special Education Consultants in Regional Professional Development Centers were trained on the presentation and held eleven public input sessions across the state during the second and third weeks of October 2005. The public input sessions were posted on the web and announced to the public in various ways, including announcements at the Special Education Administrators' Conference, the Council of Administrators of Special Education meeting, various regional meetings, and the Special Education Listserv which reaches all school districts and various organizations. In addition, flyers were sent to SEAP members for distribution.

Across the eleven public input sessions, 63 people attended of which most were Local Education Agency (LEA) special education administrators and a few parents. The input was compiled and used to revise targets for school-age least restrictive environments, and to remove, revise or add improvement activities. The revised State Performance Plan was presented to the SEAP November 4, 2005, and additional feedback was incorporated into the final plan.

Public Dissemination and Reporting:

This State Performance Plan will be posted on the Department's website, and districts will be notified via the Special Education Listserv as well as through a mailing to Superintendents. DESE will report annually to the public on the state's performance compared to the targets established in this SPP. In addition, DESE will report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA. Specifics on the public reporting of data will be addressed under each SPP Indicator. In summary, a public "report card" or "profile" will be posted on the Department's website for each LEA. Data in cells with less than five students will be suppressed when publicly reported in order to maintain the confidentiality of the data.

Overview of Missouri's Educational System:

Missouri has 524 local educational agencies (LEAs) or school districts, three state board operated programs (Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped), and 23 charter schools located in the St. Louis City and Kansas City school districts.

DESE is also responsible for oversight of educational programs provided through the Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) and the Department of Corrections (DOC).

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) is responsible for accrediting all public schools in the state and does so over a five-year cycle. Local school districts and other responsible agencies (charter schools, DOC, DYS, and the three state board operated programs) are each reviewed once during the five-year MSIP cycle.

Missouri is currently (2005-06) in the last year of the third cycle of MSIP, and DESE is working to finalize plans for the fourth cycle which begins with the 2006-07 school year and ends in 2011-12. All districts in the state are divided among the five years of the cycle, and each year contains a representative sample of districts. The group of districts to be reviewed in each year of the fourth cycle of MSIP has not yet been finalized, but is expected to closely resemble the groupings from the second cycle of MSIP. In order to determine if the sets of districts are each representative of the state, data have been examined by the following factors:

- Number of districts in each year of cycle. Each year has approximately 105 districts.
- Region of the state as defined by the areas for the nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC). All regions are represented in each year of the cycle.
- Total enrollment and enrollment by race. All races are represented in each year of the cycle.
- Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. The percentage of eligible students is relatively consistent across all years.
- Enrollment size groups. Districts were divided into enrollment size groups of 1-200, 201-400, 401-88, 801-2000, 2001-6000 and 6000+. All enrollment size groups are represented in all years of the cycle.

No school districts in the state have an average daily attendance of more than 50,000 so none are required to be included in the sample each year.

DESE has a policy of reviewing all programs in a district during the same year, therefore the Office of Special Education adopts the MSIP review cycle. Since the districts in each year of the cycle represent the state as a whole as described above, the Office of Special Education will be able to gather certain data required by this State Performance Plan in conjunction with the MSIP review cycle.

Data Sources:

The following summarizes the data sources for the SPP Indicators:

DESE's Core Data Collection System: District data for federal and state reporting are submitted annually to DESE from the individual school districts. DESE does not have a student information system from which district or statewide data can be compiled. Instead, aggregate data are reported through Core Data which is a web-based data collection system with interactive edits. Included in the system are several integrated screens that are used to update or enter new information. Two screens, 11 and 12, are used to report Special Education child count, placement and exiter data. Other screens are used for reporting data on all students from which data for students with disabilities can be disaggregated, including discipline and graduate follow-up. Core Data information will be used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14. Many of these data are currently reported back to districts in their Special Education District Profiles. This report is prepared by the Office of Special Education and made available to districts for data verification and program evaluation.

Missouri Assessment Program (MAP): Missouri's statewide assessment program provides the data used for SPP Indicator 3.

Special Education General Supervision Monitoring: Data is gathered in conjunction with the MSIP review cycle either in the review year, or in the year prior to the review through the Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) for SPP Indicators 8, 11, 12 and 13. Data for the new indicators on Part C to Part B transition timelines and evaluation timelines will be gathered for all students in the districts being reviewed in any given year. Data on parent involvement will be gathered through parent survey done in conjunction with the MSIP review. Data on secondary transition plans will be gathered on a representative sample of students for each district being reviewed in any given year.

A new data collection will be put in place for SPP Indicator 7 either through the Core Data Collection System or some other system.

Focused Monitoring and State Improvement Grant Priority Areas:

The Missouri Office of Special Education is highly committed to the priority areas of elementary achievement and secondary transition which were identified by the Special Education Advisory Committee subsequent to the completion of Missouri's Self-Assessment in 2002. In August 2004, the Office of Special Education was awarded a State Improvement Grant (SIG) that focuses on improving elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities which will serve to enhance the strategies in regard to the priority areas. SIG dollars were earmarked to address elementary achievement, post-secondary outcomes and Part C to Part B transition. In order to allocate SIG dollars for elementary achievement and secondary transition, districts were grouped by Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) regions and ranked by various performance measures. Approximately 50 districts were selected and notified that they were eligible to use SIG awards for professional development or programs to increase performance. These districts worked with Special Education Consultants located in the RPDCs during the 2004-05 school year to analyze data and develop improvement plans. Forty-five districts received grants in the fall of 2005 to implement their improvement plans in either elementary achievement, secondary transition, or both.

During the time that DESE was identifying districts for SIG assistance; Missouri developed a pilot process for focused monitoring. Elementary achievement and secondary transition are the areas of focus. Ten districts identified through the SIG analysis also had district accreditation reviews during 2004-05, and were selected for the focused monitoring pilot. The focused monitoring reviews were conducted by DESE staff and included data analysis, file reviews and interviews with students, parents and district staff. DESE and RPDC consultants are conducting focused monitoring reviews during the 2005-06 school year.

Several revisions to the focused monitoring process were made prior to the second year of the pilot. Reviews conducted in 2005-06 are designed to be a comprehensive review of district performance and compliance and are expected to resemble the monitoring process that will be used for the fourth cycle of MSIP which begins with the 2006-07 school year.

Special Education Staff at the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs):

DESE contracts with nine RPDCs across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts. The Office of Special Education began utilizing Special Education Consultants in each region during the 2003-04 school year. In July 2005, DESE added additional training and compliance consultants to expand to a total of 34 consultants. These consultants are playing a major role in the implementation of the SIG scope of work, improvement planning and focused monitoring efforts in districts. Consultants work with school districts, other RPDC staff and state consultants and supervisors to improve student academic performance in districts and/or schools as identified through either special education or general education data analysis. These personnel deliver and support Office of Special Education professional development initiatives relative to meeting performance goals and indicators as well as other non-Office of Special Education professional development initiatives. There are five types of special education consultants:

- Improvement Consultants (11 personnel) facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data based 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
- Regional Technical Assistance Coaches (RTACs) (9 personnel) align, coordinate, deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans.
- Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Coaches (6 personnel) identify and recruit districts and buildings for PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of PBS.
- Compliance Consultants (5 personnel) work with districts to understand compliance requirements, conduct self-reviews, and write and implement corrective action plans.

- Blindness Skills Specialists (3 personnel) consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these five types of special education personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

Annual Program Evaluation Model

Districts are required to conduct a program evaluation annually in order to assess, at a minimum, the districts' progress on state performance goals. In order to assist districts with conducting quality program evaluation, the Office of Special Education created a model and guide for program evaluation. The purpose of this guide is to explain the model and provide examples of the components used in program evaluation to meet MSIP and Special Education compliance standards. The guide can be used as a planning tool in the development of an improvement plan for making decisions about ongoing professional development and program needs. The model and guide offer:

- Guidelines to the basic components of conducting a program evaluation
- Questions to consider when completing each component of the program evaluation
- Examples of how the process unfolds, including a seven-step drill down process to data analysis for use in evaluating program goals in a manner that leads to revealing root causes.

During 2005-06 the Office of Special Education is working to add sections that will specifically address discipline and disproportionality to the model and guide.

Targeted Technical Assistance to Districts

The SPP Indicators include two recurring improvement activities. Those activities are

- Targeted technical assistance to districts and
- Compiling and publishing online evidence-based and promising practices.

Targeted technical assistance to districts involves identifying districts most in need of improvement through data analysis or compliance monitoring and then deploying RPDC Consultants to assist with district-specific:

- Analysis of root causes in policies, procedures and practices
- Improvement planning or corrective action planning that addresses the district's specific needs
- Arranging for evidence-based professional development including, but not limited to:
    - Differentiated Instruction
    - Least Restrictive Environments (LRE)
    - Least Restrictive Environments for Early Childhood Special Education
    - Positive Behavior Supports (PBS)
    - Functional Behavior Plans
    - Behavioral Intervention Plans
    - Curriculum-based Measurement
    - Problem Solving
    - Measurable Goals
    - Co-teaching / Collaboration
    - Quality Eligibility Determination (QED)
- Arranging for other professional development as needed, including, but not limited to:
    - Compliance requirements
    - Accommodation training
    - Alternate Assessment training
    - Response to Intervention (RTI)
- Implementation of and problem-solving for a professional development plan
- Ongoing coaching and monitoring of progress

Compiling evidence-based and promising practices involves identifying a menu of evidence-based practices for use in developing improvement and professional development plans.

<u>Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2010</u>

For each indicator in this SPP, it is noted whether the information is repeated with no changes from the previous SPP submitted in February 2009 (originally submitted December 2005), or if changes were made to targets or improvement activities. The Annual Performance Report provides updates to the information in this SPP.

The Office 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 Office of Special Education staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, Office of Special Education staff has worked to review and revise all existing Improvement Activities, align the activities with all contractual activities and develop Action Plans and implementation and impact measures for every activity.

Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2011

Per OSEP instructions:

- SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13) in this SPP.
- New baseline data, targets and Improvement Activities for Indicators 4B, 13 and 14 have been included.
- Targets for Indicator 7 have been revised to reflect improvement over the baseline.

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

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO NEW IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THIS SPP.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2010

Per instructions for the SPP/APR submitted February 1, 2010, 2007-08 data is reported in the 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).

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 this SPP have not been revised to match the targets established under Title I of the ESEA. The targets in this SPP will be revised in conjunction with future revisions to the accountability workbook for Missouri.

The following is repeated from the SPP submitted December 1, 2005

Missouri’s Special Education Advisory Panel established secondary transition as a priority area for the state for improvement planning purposes after the October 2002 submission of Missouri’s Self-Assessment. Since that time, several professional development trainings related to secondary transition have been developed and are being implemented. DESE is contracting with its Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), the Missouri Parent’s Act (MPACT), to adapt the *Transition to Empowered Lifestyles* curriculum into an online format.

State Improvement Grant (SIG) dollars were earmarked to address secondary transition. In order to allocate SIG dollars for transition, districts were ranked by graduation and dropout rates, among other factors. Approximately 30 districts were selected and notified that they were eligible to use SIG awards for professional development or programs to improve secondary transition outcomes. These districts worked with the RPDC consultants at the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC) to drill down and analyze data in order to determine root causes of low performance in secondary transition. As of November 2005, 31 districts have approved plans and $1,198,427 SIG dollars have been awarded for implementing plans. RPDC consultants continue to work with the districts as the plans are implemented.

During 2004-05, the state also developed a pilot process for focused monitoring of which secondary transition is a priority area. Seven districts that had been identified through the SIG analysis were having district accreditation reviews during 2004-05, and were selected for the focused monitoring pilot process. DESE staff conducted the focused monitoring reviews which included data analysis, file reviews and interviews with students, parents and district staff. Following the reviews, reports to the districts provided findings and suggestions for improvement. These results were incorporated into the district’s improvement plan funded with SIG dollars. Seven additional districts will be reviewed during 2005-06 in

the area of secondary transition as the focused monitoring procedures are further refined for full implementation during 2006-07.

Missouri has a state-level Transition Team made up of representatives from the Office of Special Educations of Special Education, Career Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. The team has identified three priority issues. The first is Schooling and involves professional development and data collection/analysis between schools and career/technical schools. The second is the review of and access to Career Education. The third is Youth Development which encompasses increasing the skills students need to be successful after school, including self-determination, self-advocacy, student-directed IEPs, etc.

In summer 2005, Missouri's State Board of Education increased the minimum number of requirements that all students must have in order to receive a high school diploma starting in 2010. Many districts already have local graduation requirements that meet or exceed the new State Board requirements, but the impact of this change will need to be monitored over the next several years to determine its impact on graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities.

Missouri also has a GED Option Program that 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 students with reasons identified in the local GED Option Program plan. School districts approved by DESE to participate in the GED Option Program can continue to receive average daily attendance funds for the participating students and are allowed to issue regular diplomas when students earn their GED. These students would then be counted as graduates rather than dropouts.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Graduation Rates						
	Students with Disabilities			All Students		
Year	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	Gap (All – Spec Ed)
2000-2001	4,995	8,146	61.3%	54,181	81.4%	20.1%
2001-2002	5,402	8,226	65.7%	54,513	82.4%	16.7%
2002-2003	5,775	8,215	70.3%	56,906	84.4%	14.1%
2003-2004	6,030	8,499	70.9%	57,988	85.5%	14.6%
2004-2005	6,001	8,369	71.7%	57,495	85.7%	14.0%

Sources: All Students data from datawarehouse table Summary_Building as of 11/21/05.
Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/21/05.
Notes: Data does not include Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) because these students were not included in reporting for all students.

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts) x 100
- All Students Graduation Rate: (Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Calculations differ for students with disabilities and all students due to the following:

Difference in Calculations/ Reporting	Students with Disabilities	All Students

Difference in Calculations/ Reporting	Students with Disabilities	All Students
Collection method	Screen 12 of Core Data by district and age	Screen 13 of Core Data by building and grade level
Exiters Reported	Students on the district's Special Education child count prior to exit during the school year	All students exiting during the school year
Graduation rate calculations	(Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts)) x 100. Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead. Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP	(Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100 Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP
Dropout rate calculations	(Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21) x 100. Total dropouts includes exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Max Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out. Average enrollment not collected for students with disabilities, uses 14-21 child count as of December 1 instead.	(Number of dropouts divided by average enrollment) x 100 Total dropouts is same as for students with disabilities Average enrollment is collected for all students

Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) are excluded from the baseline data and calculations above since students in those facilities can earn GEDs but not regular diplomas, and GED recipients are counted in the dropout category. Therefore, in order to look at data that is most representative of regular school districts, their data are excluded from the graduation and dropout calculations shown here and for setting future targets.

Trend data for the past five years show that graduation rates have been increasing for both students with disabilities and all students. Over the past five years, the gap between students with disabilities and all students has decreased by more than 6%.

Graduation rate data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years. Public reporting of special education data will include graduation rates as described above for every district every year. Graduation rates for all students are publicly reported on DESE's website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	73.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities
2006-2007	74.0%
2007-2008	75.0%
2008-2009	74.0%
2009-2010	74.5%
2010-2011	75.0%
2011-2012	Need to decide what targets are and then extend them
2012-2013	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
1.1 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 state-wide plan for post secondary transition programs and services.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff and KU	Active Revised 2/10
1.2 Manage and support a Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field, and interact with other educators throughout the state.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff and KU	Active Revised 2/10
1.3 Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option program	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, Office of Special Education of Career Education	Active Revised 2/10
1.4 Recruit and support transition liaisons in all RPDC regions to increase state capacity to provide training and information in the area of post secondary transition	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, KU	Active Revised 2/10
1.5 Recruit and support Community Transition Teams in all RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of best practices.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, KU, Transition Liaisons, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
1.6 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
1.7 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
1.8 Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, KU	Active Revised 2/10
1.9 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on post secondary transition	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
1.10 Support scale-up of the Transition to College Program to assist students with disabilities in accessing and succeeding in post-secondary education	2011/12-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	New 2/11

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
1.11 Support scale-up of National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) program to additional districts in the state	2011/12-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, NDPC-SD staff	NEW 2/11

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED (SEE INDICATOR 1).

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2010

Per instructions for the SPP/APR submitted February 1, 2010, 2007-08 data is reported in the 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).

The following is repeated from the SPP submitted December 1, 2005

See Overview of Issue on Indicator 1.

Missouri uses dropout numbers as part of the denominator in graduation rate calculations; therefore, the graduation and dropout rates are related. However, the denominators for the two calculations are different resulting in two rates that are related, but cannot be summed. Graduation and dropout rates are both considered when assessing secondary transition issues.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Dropout Rates						
	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
Year	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-22	Drop Out Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2000-2001	3,151	42,291	7.5%	11,046	4.2%	3.3%
2001-2002	2,824	44,000	6.4%	9,554	3.6%	2.8%
2002-2003	2,440	45,505	5.4%	8,994	3.3%	2.1%
2003-2004	2,469	45,939	5.4%	9,065	3.4%	2.0%
2004-2005	2,368	46,188	5.1%	10,341	3.8%	1.3%

Sources: All Students Data from datawarehouse table Summary_Building as of 11/21/05. Students with Disabilities Data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/21/05.
Notes: Data does not include Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) because these students were not included in reporting for all students.

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-22
- All Students Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Average enrollment
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See table for Indicator 1

Dropout rates for students with disabilities have decreased significantly over the past five years. Gaps in dropout rates between all students and students with disabilities have also decreased.

Dropout rate data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years. Public reporting of special education data will include dropout rates for every district every year. Dropout rates for all students are publicly reported on DESE's website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	4.7% dropout rate for students with disabilities
2006-2007	4.5%
2007-2008	4.3%
2008-2009	5.0%
2009-2010	4.9%
2010-2011	4.8%
2011-2012	4.8%
2012-2013	4.8%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 1—Graduation Rates

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO OF THE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED.

Indicator 3 – Participation and performance of children with IEPs 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)].

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Until the 2005-06 school year, Missouri's statewide assessment, the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) was administered at three grade spans (elementary, middle and high). In order to comply with the requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, beginning with the spring 2006 administration of the assessment, communication arts and mathematics will be assessed at each grade 3-8 and once in high school. The new grade level assessments were field tested in spring 2005 and those results will be used to adjust the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) proficiency goals required by the NCLB in February/March 2006. This plan to revise AYP goals has approval from the U.S Department of Education.

State Improvement Grant (SIG) dollars are targeted to address elementary achievement. In order to allocate SIG dollars, districts were ranked by performance on Communication Arts Grade 3 and Mathematics Grade 4, along with other factors. Approximately 30 districts were selected and notified that they were eligible to use SIG awards for professional development or programs to improve elementary achievement. These districts worked with the RPDC consultants to analyze data in order to develop improvement plans. As of November 2005, 26 districts have approved plans and $793,106 SIG dollars have been awarded to implement the improvement plans. Consultants will continue to work with the districts as the improvement plans are implemented.

Missouri is also piloting a focused monitoring process that has elementary achievement as a priority area. Six districts that had been identified through the SIG analysis were having district accreditation reviews during 2004-05, and were therefore selected for the focused monitoring pilot process. DESE staff conducted the focused monitoring reviews which included data analysis, file reviews and interviews with students, parents and district staff. Following the reviews, reports to the districts provided findings and suggestions for improvement. Six additional districts will be reviewed during 2005-06 as the focused monitoring procedures are further refined for full implementation during 2006-07.

Special Education Consultants at the RPDCs are also working closely with districts implementing Reading First. Professional development for Differentiated Instruction and Curriculum Based Measurement are available for all educators.

MAP-Alternate
During 2004-05, DESE contracted with Measured Progress to assist in the revision of the MAP-Alternate. These new assessments for mathematics and communication arts are based on grade level expectations and will be administered at grades 3-8 and high school assessments at grade 11 for communication arts and grade 10 for mathematics, consistent with the regular MAP assessments in spring 2006. The revised MAP-A was piloted in spring 2005.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

OSEP requires that all states report baseline data for 2004-05. Missouri is including these data to satisfy the requirements; however, these data will not correspond to the revised Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals that will be set in conjunction with the setting of standards for the new grade level assessments being implemented in 2006.

A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup.

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2005 were 26.6% for Communication Arts and 17.5% for Mathematics. The proficiency goals for 2004 were 20.4% for Communication Arts and 10.3% for Mathematics.

Communication Arts – Grades 3, 7 & 11

	IEP District Met w/ n*	Total District with n*	Percent Met
2004	34	111	30.6%
2005	23	112	20.5%

Mathematics – Grades 4, 8 & 10

	IEP District Met w/ n*	Total District with n*	Percent Met
2004	90	116	77.6%
2005	58	114	50.9%

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes is 50.

<u>Updated baseline data submitted February 1, 2007 SPP</u>

Year	Subject	District MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2005	Communication Arts	23	112	20.5%
	Mathematics	57	116	49.1%
	Combined	20	123	16.3%

Note that the data for Mathematics has changed slightly since submission of the SPP in 12/05.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

2005 MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with IEPs

	Total	Regular MAP Assessment	MAP-Alternate Assessment	Participation Rate	Absent	Not Assessed
Comm Arts Grade 3	10,264	9,992	0	97.3%	25	247
Comm Arts Grade 7	10,789	10,412	0	96.5%	114	263
Comm Arts Grade 11	7,525	6,991	300	96.9%	168	66
Comm Arts Total	28,578	27,395	300	96.9%	307	576
Mathematics Grade 4	10,403	10,012	309	99.2%	21	61
Mathematics Grade 8	10,913	10,363	368	98.3%	120	62
Mathematics Grade 10	8,971	8,520	0	95.0%	215	236
Mathematics Total	30,287	28,895	677	97.6%	356	359

Students included in the "Not Assessed" category include students who were determined eligible to take the alternate assessment by the IEP team, but who did not submit a portfolio for one of two reasons:

1) In 2004 and 2005, the MAP Alternate (MAP-A) was assessed at grades 4, 8 and 11. Previously, the MAP-A was assessed at ages 9, 13 and 17. When the DESE made the transition from age eligibility to grade eligibility, students that were grade eligible in 2004 or 2005 were not required to participate in the assessment if they had been assessed in one of the prior two years.
2) In 2005, the MAP-A was not required for grades 3, 7 and 10 so any student eligible to take the alternate assessment in those grades were not assessed. New assessments for mathematics and communication arts will be in place in spring 2006 for grades 3-8 and high school assessments at grade 11 for communication arts and grade 10 for mathematics. Therefore, all MAP-A eligible students will be assessed annually beginning in 2006.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

"Proficiency" includes the top two of five achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP assessments, and Proficient for the MAP-Alternate.

2005 MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities

	Total	Proficient - Regular Assessment	Proficient - Alternate Assessment	Proficiency Rate
Comm Arts Grade 3	10,264	2,142	0	20.9%
Comm Arts Grade 7	10,789	723	0	6.7%
Comm Arts Grade 11	7,525	122	210	4.4%
Comm Arts Total	28,578	2,987	210	11.2%
Mathematics Grade 4	10,403	2,473	217	25.9%
Mathematics Grade 8	10,913	200	284	4.4%
Mathematics Grade 10	8,971	153	0	1.7%
Mathematics Total	30,287	2,826	501	11.0%

See note on MAP-Alternate testing above.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The number and percent of districts meeting AYP goals decreased from 2004 to 2005, however, the proficiency goals increased by 6-7%. Any improvement in scores made by districts did not keep up with the increased proficiency goals. The targets presented below show minimal improvement, whereas any increase at all is unlikely due to the increase in the proficiency goals needed in order to have 100% proficiency by 2014.

Data show the percent of students with disabilities participating in the MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments has been over 95% for the past three years and over 97% in 2005.

MAP Assessment data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years and includes participation and performance data for students with disabilities. AYP subgroup data and status are publicly reported on DESE's website. Additional public reporting of special education data will include assessment participation and performance data for every district every year.

Update to SPP submitted February 1, 2007

Due to the implementation of annual grade level assessments in 2006 for grades 3 through 8 and a high school assessment as well as state legislation requiring the use of four achievement levels, the proficiency targets for AYP were revised for 2005-2006 and all subsequent school years. The following targets have been revised accordingly. Due to these changes, and OSEP's instruction that the AYP target should reflect a combined AYP determination, the targets for percent of districts meeting AYP are being revised. For both AYP and proficiency, the 2006 data reported in the APR will be considered the new baseline. The targets for participation are being changed from 100% to 95% to correspond with AYP determinations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	Percent of districts meeting AYP: 30% Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 34.7% Math – 26.6%
2006-2007	District AYP: 33% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 42.9% Math – 35.8%
2007-2008	District AYP: 34% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 51.0% Math – 45.0%
2008-2009	District AYP: 35% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 59.2% Math – 54.1%
2009-2010	District AYP: 36% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 67.4% Math – 63.3%
2010-2011	District AYP: 37% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 75.5% Math – 72.5%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2011-2012	District AYP: 37% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 83.7% Math – 81.7%
2012-2013	District AYP: 37% Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95% Proficiency: CA – 91.8% Math – 90.8%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
3.1 Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education, eMINTS Staff	Active Revised 2/10
3.2 Develop and pilot an integrated three tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective three tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Revised 2/10
3.3 Provide information to various stakeholders on Response to Intervention (RtI) "three-tiered models of student support"	2010/11-2012/13	DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Added 2/10
3.4 Provide training/pd to districts through the RPDC consultants on Response to Intervention (RtI)) "three-tiered models of student support"	2010/11-2012/13	DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Added 2/10
3.5 Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
3.6 Support through Project ACCESS the development of services and programs to increase school districts' capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, Project ACCESS Staff	Active Added 2/10
3.7 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
3.8 Provide targeted technical assistance	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special	Active

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.		Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Revised 2/10
3.9 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
3.10 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED FROM THE 2/2010 SPP TO CLARIFY THE PROCESS USED FOR EACH PART OF THE INDICATOR (A & B). PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4:

The Department collects disciplinary actions for all students in order to meet federal requirements for Gun Free Schools and IDEA, and state requirements for Safe Schools. The data collection includes every suspension/expulsion and the number of days of removal for each along with student demographic information.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy: Missouri utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. As described below, a district would be found to have a significant discrepancy in suspension expulsion rates if the district has a ratio greater than 4.0 (mean + one standard deviation for 2007-08 data), with adjustments for low discipline rates, for two consecutive years. Ratio calculations are described below under section entitled

Update for SPP Indicator 4A submitted February 1, 2011.

.

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

Recommend to delete all of this text.RPDC Consultants work with districts that have discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions/expulsions. Data analysis includes examination of discipline policies, procedures and practices. If the review of data indicates a need for revisions or additional training, State Improvement Grant (SIG) money can be used to support professional development. Progress for those districts in regard to suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities (results of review, what revisions, if any, were made) is tracked. Six Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) coaches are employed by the RPDCs as part of the team of special education consultants. The PBS coaches are heavily involved in the review of districts with significant discrepancies in discipline rates. The state is identifying PBS demonstration sites as exemplars for other districts.

Professional development that addresses discipline includes Positive Behavior Supports modules addressing each tier of intervention as well as training for PBS coaches. The Office of Special Education is planning to create an addendum to the program evaluation model to examine policies, procedures and practices surrounding discipline. Suspension/expulsion data are included in the special education district profiles and are updated annually for each district in order to assist with the program evaluation.

Districts with identified significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates will be required to complete the program evaluation regarding discipline. These will be reviewed by DESE with verification through desk review, onsite review or by the RPDC consultants. Corrective actions will be required when necessary. Discipline was a component of the focused monitoring reviews conducted in 2004-05. Data were examined and discussed with district personnel.

No districts with significant discrepancies that were identified through analysis of 2003-04 data continue to have significant discrepancies in 2004-05. Recommend to delete all of this text.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4A:

Disciplinary actions for 2004-05 were reported on an incident level for any incident resulting in ten or more days of suspension or expulsion. From this incident-level report, the Office of Special Education reports to OSEP the number of children with disabilities who received disciplinary action on Table 5 of the Annual Report of Children Served. Comparisons between the data reported in the OSEP tables and the incident-level data show very little difference in proportions by disability category or race, therefore, the following analysis uses the incident-level data rather than the derived student-level data.

States must look at discrepancies either:

A. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities BETWEEN districts
   - Compare District X's rate to District Y's rate
B. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with and without disabilities WITHIN districts
   - Compare District X's rates for students with disabilities to District X's rates for nondisabled students

DESE will use Method B because this will eliminate the need for analysis of policies, procedures and practices between districts. Discipline incidents include any incident 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 count 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 All Students (Number of incidents for all students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Any ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation is considered a significant discrepancy.Moved from below Baseline data.

Update for SPP Indicator 4A submitted February 1, 2011

REVISED DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFICATION PROCESS – COPIED FROM APR FOR 09-10 With this SPP/APR for 2009-10, Missouri had changed the methodology used to identify districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsions rates. 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)

Previously, the mean and standard deviation of the district ratios was calculated, and districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation were considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The new methodology for evaluating the data for 2008-09 and future years utilizes a set cut point rather than the mean + one standard deviation to determine if a discrepancy exists. The set cut point eliminates the impact of outlier districts as well as potential changes to the mean and standard deviation if districts update their discipline data submissions.

The cut point used for Indicator 4A is 4.0. This compares to a mean + one standard deviation of 4.13 for data from the 2008-09 school year, so is a more rigorous cut point than would have been used under the previous methodology.

Baseline Data for Indicator 4A for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Recommend this move above to overview section.

Disciplinary actions for 2004-05 were reported on an incident level for any incident resulting in ten or more days of suspension or expulsion. From this incident-level report, the Office of Special Education reports to OSEP the number of children with disabilities who received disciplinary action on Table 5 of the Annual Report of Children Served. Comparisons between the data reported in the OSEP tables and the incident-level data show very little difference in proportions by disability category or race, therefore, the following analysis uses the incident-level data rather than the derived student-level data.

States must look at discrepancies either:

C. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities BETWEEN districts
   - Compare District X's rate to District Y's rate

D. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with and without disabilities WITHIN districts
   - Compare District X's rates for students with disabilities to District X's rates for nondisabled students

DESE will use Method B because this will eliminate the need for analysis of policies, procedures and practices between districts. Discipline incidents include any incident 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 count 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 All Students (Number of incidents for all students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Any ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation is considered a significant discrepancy.Recommend this move above to overview section.

Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and All Students for 2004-05

	(A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD	(B) Count of Discipline Incidents for All Students	(C) IEP Child Count Ages 3-22	(D) Total Enrollment	(E) Incident Rate per 100 SWD	(F) Incident Rate per 100 Students	(G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:All
All Districts	2,065	9,714	131,497	888,102	1.57	1.09	1.44
Districts with >4 Incidents for Students with IEPs	1,800	7,458	72,024	486,684	2.50	1.53	1.63
Mean Ratio							2.33
Standard Deviation							1.17
Mean + 1 Standard Deviation							3.50

Calculations:
E = (A / C) x 100 meaning, on average, there are 2.50 incidents per 100 students with disabilities
F = (B / D) x 100 meaning, on average, there are 1.53 incidents per 100 students
G = E / F
Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data

Ratio of Discipline Rates for Students with Disabilities to Discipline Rates for All Students

Year	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean + 1 Std. Dev.	Districts with Sig. Disc.	Total Districts	Percent of Districts
2004-05	2.33	1.17	3.50	10	524	1.9%

Data Source: District-reported data on Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)
Discipline Rate = Number of Discipline Incidents / Number of Students

Recommend this table be deleted. This was included for old 4B and is confusing to current situation.

Number of Discipline Incidents Reported by Race, 2004-05 School Year

	All		Disabled		Enrollment
	#	%	#	%	%
White, non-Hispanic	4,432	45.7%	1,111	54.0%	77.4%
Black, non-Hispanic	4,967	51.2%	901	43.8%	17.9%
Hispanic	216	2.2%	33	1.6%	2.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	38	0.4%	3	0.1%	1.5%
Native American	44	0.5%	9	0.4%	0.4%
Total	9,697	100.0%	2,057	100.0%	100.0%

Discussion of Baseline Data for Indicator 4A: Through the analysis of data for students with disabilities and all students, ten districts, 1.9% of all districts, were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. Discipline data show disproportionate percentages by race, however special education data is somewhat less disproportionate than that of all students.

For Part A of this indicator, DESE will identify significant discrepancies as described above, while attempting to lower the average ratio of discipline rates of students with disabilities to all students within districts. Discipline data has been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years and

includes discipline rates for students with disabilities and all students. Public reporting of data will include these discipline rates and the ratio for every district every year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4B:

Missouri is using a method identical to Indicator 4A to determine if districts have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates by race. The same methodology used for all students (described above and in the APR) was conducted for each racial/ethnic group. The same cut point of 4.0 is being used for both Indicator 4A and 4B.

Baseline Data for Indicator 4B for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Discipline Summary Based on 2008-09 Data

	Black	White	Asian, Native American, Hispanic
Total number of districts	561	561	561
Districts with five or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	43	72	0
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	1	15	0
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates	1	7	0
(a) Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)**	0	0	0
(b) Districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	0	0	0
(b) as a percent of districts	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**N/A**

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file

Moved this up under 4A baseline data. **Discussion of Baseline Data for Indicator 4A:** Through the analysis of data for students with disabilities and all students, ten districts, 1.9% of all districts, were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. Discipline data show disproportionate percentages by race, however special education data is somewhat less disproportionate than that of all students.

For Part A of this indicator, DESE will identify significant discrepancies as described above, while attempting to lower the average ratio of discipline rates of students with disabilities to all students within districts. Discipline data has been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years and includes discipline rates for students with disabilities and all students. Public reporting of data will include these discipline rates and the ratio for every district every year. **Moved this up under 4A baseline data.**

Discussion of Baseline Data for Indicator 4B: When data are examined by race/ethnicity, a small number of districts meet the minimum cell size, and even fewer exceed the ratio cut point of 4.0. The state has been examining discipline data by race for several years, and there is very little consistency from one year to the other, largely due to the lower number of discipline incidents when the data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity. All of these factors result in no districts being identified as having significant discrepancies in discipline rates by race/ethnicity and, therefore, no reviews were conducted.

	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	A: 1.7% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates B: NA
2006-2007	A: 1.5% B: NA
2007-2008	A: 1.2% B: NA
2008-2009	A: 1.0% B: NA
2009-2010	A: 0.8% B: NA
2010-2011	A: 0.5% B: NA
2011-2012	A: 0.5% B: 0%
2012-2013	A: 0.5% B: 0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
4.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
4.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
4.3 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
4.4 Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 9/10
4.5 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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))

Measurement:

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.

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.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri's special education placements for school-aged students with disabilities continue to show increases in the percent of students being educated with their non-disabled and is generally better than the nation as a whole.

Quality placement decisions and least restrictive environments are emphasized in a variety of ways:

- Special Education District Profiles report trend data on educational placements
- Performance calls (met/not met) on placement data are included in monitoring reports
- Focused monitoring reviews are looking closely at LRE decisions through file reviews and interviews
- Analysis of district data conducted by LEA staff and RPDC Consultants is identifying LRE as an issue in some districts and improvement plans (SIG funded) are addressing the issues
- Professional development modules regarding LRE are offered and required as corrective actions, when appropriate.
- Professional development on Differentiated Instruction and Curriculum Based Measurement are provided to support students in the general education environment
- Annual Program Evaluation model encourages analysis of all aspects of the special education system, and emphasizes the importance of the LRE

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Special Education Placement Data for ages 5K-21

	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Inside Reg Class ≥ 80%%	**76,091**	**56.74%**	**76,805**	**57.67%**	**76,674**	**58.05%**
Inside Reg Class 40-79%	37,651	28.08%	36,709	27.56%	36,006	27.26%
Inside Reg Class < 40%	**15,861**	**11.83%**	**15,045**	**11.30%**	**14,741**	**11.16%**
Private Separate (Day) Fac.	889	0.66%	931	0.70%	1,004	0.76%
Public Separate (Day) Fac.	1,717	1.28%	1,846	1.39%	1,890	1.43%
Homebound/Hospital	560	0.42%	589	0.44%	527	0.40%
Private Residential Facility	41	0.03%	49	0.04%	25	0.02%
State Operated Schools	1,229	0.92%	1,208	0.91%	1,207	0.91%
Public Residential Facility	57	0.04%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total Separate	**4,493**	**3.35%**	**4,623**	**3.47%**	**4,653**	**3.52%**
Total School Age	134,096	100.00%	133,182	100.00%	132,074	100.00%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data on least restrictive environments show that Missouri has been moving towards less restrictive placements over the last several years. The targets presented below continue this movement.

Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2008

Targets for 2007-08 and subsequent years for the percent of students inside regular class at least 80% of the day (removed from regular class < 21%) have been revised due to the change in data collection which removes parentally-placed private school students and students in correctional facilities from the targeted categories.

Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2009

Targets for 2008-09 and subsequent years have been revised.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day: 59% Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 11.0% Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.50%
2006-2007	≥ 80%: 60.0% < 40%: 10.9% Other Settings: 3.45%
2007-2008	≥ 80%: 59.0% < 40%: 10.8% Other Settings: 3.40%
2008-2009	≥ 80%: 58.5% < 40%: 10.4% Other Settings: 3.60%
2009-2010	≥ 80%: 59.0% < 40%: 10.3% Other Settings: 3.55%
2010-2011	≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50%
2011-2012	≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50%
2012-2013	≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
5.1 Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction).	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active Revised 2/10
5.2 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for differentiated instruction, three-tiered models and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active New 2/10
5.3 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.	2008/09-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
5.4 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
5.5 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

TEXT FROM PREVIOUS SPP UNDER THE OVERVIEW SECTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, NO REPORTING IS REQUIRED FOR THIS INDICATOR FOR THE FEBRUARY 1, 2011 SPP.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Text from the previous SPP under this section has been removed. Per OSEP instructions, no reporting is required for this indicator for the February 1, 2011 SPP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):

Per OSEP instructions, no reporting is required for this indicator for the February 1, 2011 SPP.

Discussion of Baseline Data, Targets and Improvement Activities:

Not applicable

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). PER OSEP REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESPONSE TABLE, TARGETS FOR 2010-11 HAVE BEEN REVISED TO REFLECT IMPROVEMENT OVER THE BASELINE.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education serves as the Lead Agency for Part C (First Steps) as well as Part B of IDEA. In order to begin the process of gathering data on these specific early childhood outcomes, Missouri convened representatives from both the First Steps and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) programs October 26-27, 2005, with organizational help from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). This work group of Parts C and B administrators met with DESE to develop a pilot process on early childhood outcomes, facilitated by Robin Rooney and Anne Lucas of NECTAC. Participants represented all regions of the state, including urban, suburban and rural communities.

In January through June 2006, three models of determining early childhood outcomes were piloted in a number of school districts/SPOE regions across the state. In spring 2006, the districts and SPOEs met to discuss the pilot and to give recommendations for full implementation of the early childhood outcomes collection.

Decisions for statewide implementation included the following:

- First Steps and ECSE should use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been or will be compiled.
- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) would be designed to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html
- The MOSS would be used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to DESE
- Each eligible child entering First Steps or ECSE beginning October 2006 must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least 6 months
- No sampling will be used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed
- Entry and exit data is to be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 will be determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely"
- All entry and exit data collected during a given year will be submitted electronically to DESE at the end of that year
- The outcome status for each child will be determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings

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

Progress Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

	Positive social-emotional skills		Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
a. Did not improve functioning	70	1.6%	86	2.0%	70	1.6%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable	155	3.7%	144	3.4%	199	4.7%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	1664	39.2%	2217	52.3%	1403	33.1%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable	1140	26.9%	1202	28.3%	1203	28.4%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable	1214	28.6%	594	14.0%	1368	32.2%
Total	4243	100.0%	4243	100.0%	4243	100.0%

Summary Statements

	Positive social-emotional skills	Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	92.6%	93.7%	90.6%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited.	55.5%	42.3%	60.6%

These data are derived from the comparison of entry to exit ratings for children who entered ECSE either during the pilot of 2005-06 or after October 2006 for all other districts and exited during 2008-09 after being in the program at least six months.

Valid and Reliable Data: Regional trainings were held across the state in the fall of 2006 for both First Steps and ECSE personnel. Training materials, including PowerPoint presentations, data tools, reporting forms and Q&A documents were posted on the web and updated annually to clarify procedures. Additionally, ongoing technical assistance has been available through the Office of Special Education.

The ECO workgroup, consisting of DESE staff, district ECSE personnel, and a Regional Professional Development Center consultant, conducted an analysis of 2008-09 ECO data. Due to variances between and among First Steps and ECSE data, the ECO workgroup determined a need to review the procedures used across the state to gather ECO data. As a result of the review, an “ECO Administration and Reporting Guidelines” document was developed and a statewide training held November 2009. The purpose of the guidelines and training was to gain a thorough understanding of the ECO administration process in both First Steps and ECSE in order to accurately measure the performance of infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities and confidently collect and share data.

In addition, a common identifier system is being used for both First Steps and ECSE, which, in future years, will allow for comparisons between the ratings for the two programs. That information will be useful in ensuring comparable data and ratings both within and between the two programs.

These activities, including training, technical assistance and data comparability checks, have helped to improve, and will continue to improve, the reliability and validity of this new data collection.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006 through 2008-2009	Not applicable
2009-2010	Social Emotional Summary Statement 1 (SS1): 83.3%; Summary Statement 2 (SS2): 49.9% Knowledge and Skills-SS1: 84.3%; SS2: 38.1% Behaviors-SS1: 81.5%; SS2: 54.5%
2010-2011	Social Emotional-SS1: 92.7%; SS2: 55.6% Knowledge and Skills-SS1: 93.8%; SS2: 42.4% Behaviors-SS1: 90.7%; SS2: 60.7%
2011-2012	Social Emotional-SS1: 92.7%; SS2: 55.6% Knowledge and Skills-SS1: 93.8%; SS2: 42.4% Behaviors-SS1: 90.7%; SS2: 60.7%
2012-2013	Social Emotional-SS1: 92.7%; SS2: 55.6% Knowledge and Skills-SS1: 93.8%; SS2: 42.4% Behaviors-SS1: 90.7%; SS2: 60.7%

The proposed targets for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 were developed by a DESE/stakeholder workgroup after a thorough review of the data. The proposed targets were finalized with input from, support of, and approval by the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE). The DESE/stakeholder group, as well as the SEAP and MoCASE felt that with complete data for only one year, and the current lack of alignment in the administration of the assessment and determination of ratings on the outcomes between the two programs (ECSE—Section 619 and First Steps—Part C), that the baseline data from only one year does not reflect a true picture of Missouri. Therefore, it was recommended by the stakeholder groups that we identify targets that are believed to be more reflective of Missouri's performance, even though they are lower than the baseline data for 2008-2009. We will revisit this data in the coming months and anticipate revising the targets for 2010-2011. In the interim we have been conducting extensive training on early childhood outcomes and have placed special emphasis on the alignment between the Part C and Part B programs; stakeholders have been very responsive to and appreciative of this training. Training evaluations have indicated a greater level of understanding of the ECO process (administration and data collection and reporting) in both Part B and C.

Update for February 1, 2011 SPP

Per OSEP instructions in the Missouri Response Table, targets for 2010-2011 have been revised to show improvement over the baseline. Targets have also been extended for two additional years. The revised and extended targets were finalized with input from, support of, and approval by the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE).

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
7.1 Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) training through periodic face to face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
7.2 Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
7.3 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
7.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). ONE NEW IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS SPP.

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 = Number 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 number of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 524 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. School district reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 524 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 complete parent survey can be found at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf. The surveys are sent to all parents in the school districts.

The parent survey was revised for use in the 4th cycle of MSIP by DESE School Improvement staff and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA). The Office of Special Education worked with the MSIP staff and OSEDA to have question(s) added to the parent survey for 2006-07 that will address this SPP indicator. The revised survey was field tested in the 2005-06 school year, however the parent survey was only field tested in one district. Data will be gathered from all districts throughout the monitoring cycle. The parent survey includes demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others. These data will be used to determine if the responses are a representative sample or to derive a representative sample for the state.

OSEDA has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from survey data each year, based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian; Majority=White). The first step is to determine the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divide them into three groups. The second step is to determine 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

A sampling target is selected, and that number of respondents is assigned to one of the six cells by randomly selecting responses until the required number of responses needed for each cell is obtained.

Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) offers information via the web and a toll free phone line as well as training sessions throughout the state. MPACT serves parents of children with all disabilities and works with public and private agencies, parent groups, professional organizations and advocacy groups. Staff and volunteers are located throughout Missouri. DESE and MPACT have collaborated on the development and delivery of training in the areas of transition and technical assistance bulletins and parents' guides. This training and information assist parents in understanding special education and their child's disability and needs. DESE and MPACT are currently offering IEP Facilitation training for district IEP team personnel.

In addition, a Parent Involvement Coordinator contracted through MPACT will be available to assist DESE in ensuring that parent involvement is incorporated into the materials developed and disseminated, as well as leading the charge to identify parent involvement models for replication and support in other districts.

Some districts in Missouri have Parent Advisory Councils (PAC) that are standing committees or councils of individuals interested in improving special education services in their district through collaboration between district personnel and parents.

RPDC Consultants are available to assist districts/buildings regarding parent participation. SIG funds are available to assist districts in accessing MPACT training modules and/or other models of parent involvement. In order to support these activities, the Office of Special Education plans to collaborate with stakeholders to identify and promote successful models of parent involvement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

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 the SPP indicator. The following table shows the rates of agreement with both questions for parents of students with disabilities and parents of nondisabled students.

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
Parents of Students with Disabilities	296 (76.49%)	91 (23.51%)	387 (100%)
Parents of Nondisabled Students	3548 (72.88%)	1320 (27.12%)	4868 (100%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since the MSIP parent survey was only piloted in one district during 2005-06, the data above only reflects responses from that one district. While that district is generally considered to be somewhat representative of the state, it is unknown how the responses on these two questions will compare to statewide data. Targets have been established based on this data. These data are being gathered in conjunction with MSIP accreditation reviews, therefore public reporting of data will include data from districts in their MSIP review year. All districts will have data collected during the five year cycle of MSIP, 2006-07 through 2010-11, which is contained within the six year SPP reporting cycle.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	Not applicable
2006-2007	77% of parents of students with disabilities will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities
2007-2008	72.5%
2008-2009	75.0%
2009-2010	77.5%
2010-2011	80.0%
2011-2012	80.0%
2012-2013	80.0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
8.1 Develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.	2010/11-2011/12	Office of Special Education	Active New 2/10
8.2 Support Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers.	2008/09-2012/13	Office of Special Education. MPACT	Active Revised 2/10
8.3 Support through the MPACT a parent mentor program that provides Technical Assistant (TA) and support to parents of students with disabilities.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education, MPACT	Active New 2/10
8.4 Support, through Project ACCESS and MPACT, the provision of materials, information, training, and resource referrals for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education, MPACT, Project ACESS	Active New 2/10
8.5 Support professional development for Parents as Teachers (PAT) parent educators to increase their knowledge and ability to inform and assist families of children with disabilities to link with needed resources	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education, PATNC	Active New 2/10
8.6 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
8.7 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants, MPACT	Active New 2/10
8.8 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in parental involvement to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants, MPACT	Active Revised 2/10
8.9 Develop and provide a Parent and Family Involvement training module to facilitate improved involvement of parents/families of students with disabilities in their children's education	2011/12-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants	New 2/11

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The original SPP submission for this indicator (February 2007) described a methodology for determining disproportionate representation that utilized two statistical tests and a minimum cell size criteria. The analyses focused on over-representation of black students in special education and in several disability categories.

OSEP's Part B FY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table required the state "to identify disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and under-representation, of races and ethnicities in special education and related services. Further… a state may, in reviewing data for each race ethnicity category, do so in a statistically appropriate manner, and may set an "n" size that applies to all racial and ethnic groups, but it must review data for all race ethnicity categories in the State and must do the analysis at the LEA level for all race and ethnic groups meeting that "n" size that are present in any of its LEAs."

OSEP's Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table also referred to the state's identification methods and use of the term "significant disproportionality." Missouri sent a response letter to OSEP on September 11, 2007. The following is an excerpt from Missouri's letter: *…our process for identifying districts under SPP indicator 9 involves making annual determinations of whether any district exhibits disproportionate representation based on race or ethnicity, but we are using numerical data collected over more than one year to identify the agencies.*

In addition, we inaccurately used the term "significant disproportionality" as opposed to "disproportionate representation" in the February 2007 SPP. The description of our identification and monitoring process in our SPP, in fact, refers to the SPP 9 requirements related to disproportionate representation. Based upon this explanation, we do not believe that we are out of compliance with 34 CFR 300.646.

Due to the inaccurate use of the term, and knowing that the February 2007 SPP was not, in fact, addressing significant disproportionality, this SPP update does not address the topic of "significant disproportionality."

Due to the requirements outlined above, Missouri changed the methodology used to identify districts with disproportionate representation for 2006-07. The new method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. Data for all districts is examined every year. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for each 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 for identifying a district as having disproportionate representation.

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"

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

For the initial writing of the State Performance Plan (February 2007), eleven districts had been identified based on 2004-05 data using the original methodology, not the new risk ratio method. In early 2006, DESE contracted with the University of Missouri to conduct the reviews of policies, procedures and practices for those districts identified as having disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education services or disproportionate representation of students who receive their special education services in restrictive placements. The reviewers made up the Missouri Disproportionality Collaborative (MODAC) which included faculty from University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia College of Education, and University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis. DESE and MODAC worked collaboratively to establish the review process, which included the NCCREST district self-assessment, staff surveys and interviews and file reviews. The rubric utilized for the reviews was an adaptation of the NCCREST Evaluation Rubric. Eighteen standards were spread across four goal areas with three possible ratings for each standard: Beginning, Developing, and At-Standard. To determine if a district had policies, practices, and procedures in place to prevent disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education placements or within restrictive special education placements, criteria was set to determine the need for any corrective action plans based upon attainment of at least 80% (14.4 marks) of the ratings within the At-Standard or Developing levels. If this total of standards was found to be lower than 80% (14.4 marks), the Office of Special Education required a corrective action plan. The districts were reviewed by the MODAC in the spring of 2006.

Final results of these reviews identified one district as having disproportionate representation that was a result of inappropriate identification. This district had over-representation of black students in special

education as well as in two disability categories. A corrective action plan was issued. The district corrected the non-compliance within twelve months of official letter notification.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the revised criteria and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. 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.

Due to OSEP guidance that if a state changes methodology then the data should be provided for previous years, the table below provides the number of districts meeting the criteria for 2005-06 (based on data from 2004-05 and 2005-06) and 2006-07 (based on data from 2005-06 and 2006-07).

Year	Number of districts meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2005-06 identification using data from 2004-05 & 2005-06	0 in any race/ethnicity groups
2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07	0 in any race/ethnicity groups

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

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 percents 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 more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black special education students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for special education students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% is compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students with disabilities.

As indicated in the table above, in 2006-07 no districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2005-06 and 2006-07, 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. Thus, 0 or 0%, of districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The identification and review processes described above result in the state being in compliance with requirements to review all racial/ethnic categories in all districts/LEAs every year for both under- and overrepresentation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
9.1 Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
9.2 Provide training and professional development resources to districts identified with inappropriate identification.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
9.3 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10
9.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Refer to the Overview of Issue in Indicator 9 for Missouri's responses to OSEP's Part B FY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table in regard to Missouri's identification procedures and the use of the term "significant disproportionality."

Also refer to the Overview of Issue in Indicator 9 for a description on changes made to the methodology used to identify and review districts with disproportionate representation. The new methodology utilizes risk ratios and cell sizes when reviewing each racial/ethnic group in every district for both under- and overrepresentation. 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"

Risk Ratio	Cell size
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)

For the initial writing of the State Performance Plan (February 2007), eleven districts had been identified based on 2004-05 data using the original methodology, not the new risk ratio method. In early 2006, DESE contracted with the University of Missouri to conduct the reviews of policies, procedures and practices for those districts identified as having disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education services or disproportionate representation of students who receive their special education services in restrictive placements. The reviewers made up the Missouri Disproportionality Collaborative (MODAC) which included faculty from University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia College of Education, and University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis. DESE and MODAC worked collaboratively to establish the review process, which included the NCCREST district self-assessment, staff surveys and interviews and file reviews. The rubric utilized for the reviews was an adaptation of the NCCREST Evaluation Rubric. Eighteen standards were spread across four goal areas with three possible ratings for each standard: Beginning, Developing, and At-Standard. To determine if a district had policies, practices, and procedures in place to prevent disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education placements or within restrictive special education placements, criteria was set to determine the need for any corrective action plans based upon attainment of at least 80% (14.4 marks) of the ratings within the At-Standard or Developing levels. If this total of standards was found to be lower than 80% (14.4 marks), the Office of Special Education required a corrective action plan. The districts were reviewed by the MODAC in the spring of 2006.

Final results of these reviews identified one district as having disproportionate representation that was a result of inappropriate identification. This district had over-representation of black students in special education as well as in two disability categories. A corrective action plan was issued. The district corrected the non-compliance within twelve months of official letter notification.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the revised criteria and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. 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.

Due to OSEP guidance that if a state changes methodology then the data should be provided for previous years, the table below provides the number of districts meeting the new risk ratio criteria for 2005-06 (based on data from 2004-05 and 2005-06) and 2006-07 (based on data from 2005-06 and 2006-07).

Year	Number of districts meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2005-06 identification using data from 2004-05 & 2005-06	• SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • ED: 2 overrepresentation of black students • MR: 5 overrepresentation of black students • OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups
2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07	• SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups • ED: 2 overrepresentation of black students • MR: 5 overrepresentation of black students • OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

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).

While overrepresentation of black students in the disability categories of Emotional Disturbance and Mental Retardation was seen for two years in a row, thereby identifying seven districts with disproportionate representation, there were other categories that met the criteria for only one year. These included both over- and under-representation of white or black students in Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech or Language Impairment, Other Health Impairment and Autism. Should a district meet the criteria for a second year, that district would be reviewed.

The district 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 percents 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 more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black MR students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for MR students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% are compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students in the MR disability category.

Information on district policies, procedures and practices was gathered from the seven districts identified as having disproportionate representation. No concerns were identified based upon the review of written policies and procedures related to identification of students with disabilities. Student files for recently identified students in the Mental Retardation or Emotional Disturbance disability categories were also gathered. The file review process outlined above was conducted. None of the seven districts were found to have disproportionate representation of students in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.

0% of districts (0 / 524 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The identification and review processes described above result in the state being in compliance with requirements to review all racial/ethnic categories in all districts/LEAs every year for both under- and overrepresentation of the required disability categories.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 9

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri has always monitored for evaluation timelines through the special education compliance reviews; however, the data collected did not result in a reportable percent of students evaluated and determined eligible within 60 days. In order to capture these data, districts that are completing a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review will submit a list of evaluations conducted during the school year and the dates/timelines associated with each student. Verification of the reported data will occur through desk reviews or on-site reviews as determined necessary. A percentage of children within timelines will be calculated from the data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Year	Number evaluated	Number within 60 day timeline	Number > 60 days with acceptable reason	Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2005-06	4,107	3,632	259	3,891	94.7%

Data from 90 districts conducting self-assessments during the 2005-06 school year.

Over 88% of all initial referrals made during 2005-06 in Missouri were completed within 60 days. An additional 6% went over 60 days but were deemed to have acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline. Approximately 75% of acceptable explanations for exceeding timelines involved school breaks, holidays, snow days, etc. Another common explanation was parent or student delays, including absences, family emergencies, etc. The reasons for exceeding timelines were reviewed by compliance supervisors and at least a quarter of the reasons deemed acceptable by districts were deemed unacceptable by the supervisors. The data provided above excludes these from the “acceptable” reasons.

Reasons determined to be unacceptable by districts and/or supervisors primarily fell under the following three areas:

- Districts waiting on outside evaluations or doctor appointments to occur, or waiting for the resulting reports to reach the district
- Districts not understanding that an eligibility staffing can occur without the parent present if the parent didn't show for the first scheduled meeting, and the second meeting notice was made through direct contact ten days prior to the second meeting, and the parent didn't show for the second scheduled meeting
- School breaks or snow days that did not fully cover the length of the delay.

If districts were found to have systemic noncompliance due to these or other reasons, the corrective action plans will direct the actions needed to obtain full compliance with this indicator.

The vast majority of delays were less than ten days past the 60 day timeline; however an isolated number had longer delays. Some of the longer delays were due to waiting for outside evaluations, which is discussed above.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data above show that the state, while not at 100%, shows substantial compliance with this indicator. This verifies findings of previous monitoring reviews which have not shown evaluation timelines to be a systemic issue in Missouri. Districts with less than 90% compliance with meeting evaluation timelines will be required to complete a corrective action plan and demonstrate full compliance within one year.

Data will be collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above.

Public reporting of these data will include the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data will be gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle beginning with SEMSAs conducted during 2005-06.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% of children will be evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
11.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
11.2 Provide training and professional development to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
11.3 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri monitors for Part C to Part B timelines through special education compliance reviews; however, until the 2004-05 school year, the data collected did not result in a reportable percent of students with IEPs developed and implemented by the third birthday. In order to capture these data, the Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) for 2004-05 was expanded to capture a list of children referred from Part C along with dates/timelines associated with each child for the 2004-05 school year. Verification of the reported data can occur through desk reviews or on-site reviews as necessary. A percentage of children within timelines will be calculated from the data. See Indicator 15 for more information on the monitoring cycle.

When noncompliance is identified, corrective actions include

- Targeted technical assistance by compliance consultants to be sure that districts understand requirement for 3rd birthday,
- Follow-up review to ensure correction within one year,
- Targeted technical assistance with First Steps to ensure that transition meetings are held in a timely manner
- Follow-up through the First Steps consultants
- Data reviews.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Part C to Part B Referrals for 2004-05

Total referred from Part C	503
Acceptable Timelines • Referred & found eligible & IEP in place by third birthday • Referred & found eligible by third birthday, IEP in place at start of school • Late referrals from Part C, but Eligibility and IEP timely • Parent delays Total	321 39 52 31 443
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday	32
Ineligible	28
Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total – Ineligible)	93.3%

Source: District reported data from 107 districts conducting SEMSAs in 2004-05.

Reasons for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Districts delaying evaluation until 3rd birthday. Misunderstanding by districts that IEP has to be in place by 3rd birthday, not just evaluation started
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

Noncompliance will be addressed through corrective actions as described above.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data will be collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above. Public reporting of these data will include the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data will be gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle, so all districts will be covered at least once during the SPP six year timeline.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
12.1 Provide training and professional development to all districts to improve collaboration and coordination with families and Part C agencies in the area of C to B Transition timelines.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
12.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT AND BASELINE DATA ARE NEW FOR THIS INDICATOR. THE TARGET REMAINS 100%. FIVE CURRENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011/12 THROUGH 2012/13). ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY THAT WAS INADVERTENTLY OMITTED FROM THE LAST SPP HAS BEEN ADDED.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

While compliance monitoring reviews have always addressed secondary transition, data had not been collected in order to report on the percent of youth for this SPP indicator. For SPP/APR reporting purposes, these data will be gathered in conjunction with the MSIP monitoring cycle. The districts in the 2006-07 MSIP review year submitted transition files to the Office of Special Education as a part of their self-assessment. The files were reviewed by staff using a rubric developed by the Office of Special Education with input from other states who were also developing their rubrics. Results of those reviews are below. For subsequent review years, districts will conduct the file review using a rubric developed by The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). The districts will enter the information in IMACS, and verification of district reported data will occur through desk reviews, additional documentation requests, and during onsite visits by DESE staff or by RPDC compliance consultants.

Based on evidence from file reviews and on-site monitoring which includes interviews with staff, students and parents, it appears districts are in need of training to improve understanding and documentation of the transition planning process. The Office of Special Education is aware of this need and has made this a priority area in planning for future training/technical assistance

.

Regional training sessions conducted during November and December, 2006 covered the new rubric, and additional technical assistance has been provided during the 2006-07 school year by the RPDC Compliance Consultants. A module on transition is scheduled to be available in spring 2007 and

this rubric will be covered as part of that training. In addition, compliance training on the new state regulations and key compliance topics will be provided state-wide in the fall of 2007, and transition will be a major component of that training.

Update to February 1, 2011 SPP

Data for this indicator for 2009-10 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment 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.

Districts completed a file review on transition age students and answered the following questions for each student:

- Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?
- Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?
- Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?
- Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- Were the transition services developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests?
- Is there evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed?

Compliance supervisors review and verify district documentation based on the above standards. Districts identified with noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Year	Number of Transition Plans Reviewed	Number that Met Standard	Percent that Met Standard
2009-10	587	536	**91.3%**

Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 111 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2009-10. A total of 97 of the 111 districts had students of transition age for whom data was collected during the year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data is collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above. Public reporting of these data includes the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data is gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle, so all districts will be covered at least once during the SPP six year timeline. Districts with identified noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that will ensure correction within 12 months.

There were 111 districts that completed a self-assessment in 2009-10. The data represent 97 districts that had transition-age students with disabilities. From those 97 districts, 587 transition plans were reviewed for compliance with Indicator 13. Of those, 536 met the standard, yielding a percent in compliance of 91.3%.

See also information for Indicator 1.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% 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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
13.1 Provide professional development/training on effective practices in post secondary transition planning to state, regional and district staff	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
13.2 Manage and support a web based data system to track improved performance in effective transition planning	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Added 2/10
13.3 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Added 2/10
13.4 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
13.5 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Added 2/10
13.6 Provide training and technical assistance on the Transition Outcomes Project (TOPs) to all districts in order to have districts at 100% compliance on Indicator 13	2007/08-2012/13	TOPs contractor, Office Of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Added 2/11

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT, TARGETS AND BASELINE DATA ARE NEW FOR THIS INDICATOR. THREE CURRENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011/12 THROUGH 2012/13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri has had a post-graduate follow-up data collection system in place for all students for many years. The collection includes a break-out of students with disabilities who had graduated the previous year. Since districts are required to report on all graduates, no sampling is used for this indicator. These data are used in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) for district accreditation purposes as well as in Special Education monitoring. Through this data collection, districts report the numbers of students who attend 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools), are competitively or non-competitively employed, are in the military, or are involved in other activities.

During the 2009-10 school year, districts were also required to conduct follow-up on students with disabilities who dropped out of grades 9-12. Districts used the same reporting methodology for dropouts as for graduates.

Also in 2009-10, additional information was collected with the follow-up categories to determine whether those continuing their education had completed a full term and whether those employed had worked for at least 20 hours per week for 90 days.

Competitive Employment: Missouri's definition of "competitive employment" in state regulations [34 361.5(b)(11)] is...work (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part- time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled.

In the data collection for this indicator there is no distinction between full-time and part-time employment.

Post-secondary Education: The definition of post-secondary education for this report includes 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools) that students are attending either full or part-time.

For more information on the definitions of graduates and dropouts, please see Indicator 1. Decide if need to leave any of this or delete all. Do we need to include OSEP's definitions?

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Graduate and Dropout Follow-up Data

	2008-09 Graduates		2008-09 Dropouts		2008-09 Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) 4 - Year College	555	8.1%	4	0.2%	559	6.4%
(2) 2 - Year College	1,465	21.3%	7	0.4%	1,472	16.9%
(3) Non – College	238	3.5%	24	1.3%	262	3.0%
(4) Competitive Employment	1,609	23.3%	171	9.5%	1,780	20.5%
(5) Noncompetitive Employment	110	1.6%	10	0.6%	120	1.4%
(6) Military	176	2.6%	3	0.2%	179	2.1%
(7) Continuing Education – did not complete one term	677	9.8%	33	1.8%	710	8.2%
(8) Employed – less than 20 hours/week or 90 days	466	6.8%	52	2.9%	518	6.0%
(9) Other	852	12.4%	347	19.3%	1,199	13.8%
(10)Unknown	743	10.8%	1,144	63.7%	1,887	21.7%
Total Follow-up	6,891	100.0%	1,795	100.0%	8,686	100.0%

Source: District-reported data via MOSIS Follow-up file

Categories (mutually exclusive)	**Number**	**Percent**
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school [(1) + (2)]	2,031	23.4%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education) [(4) + (6)]	1,959	22.6%
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) [(3)]	262	3.0%
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed) [(5)]	120	1.4%
Other categories [(7) + (8) + (9) + (10)	4,314	49.7%

Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,686	100.0%

Summary Measures (Baseline Data)	**Number**	**Percent**
A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)]	2,031	23.4%
B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)]	3,990	45.9%
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. [(1) + (2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6)]	4,372	50.3%
Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,686	

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Prior to the 2009-10 collection, follow-up data on dropouts was conducted at the state level. With the changes to the SPP Indicator, the decision was made to have districts conduct the follow-up on dropouts as well as graduates. Also new in 2009-10 was the requirement to collect additional detail on students enrolled in postsecondary education or employed in order to determine whether the students had completed a full term or the length of their employment.

Districts were notified of these data collection changes multiple times via listserv announcements and conference presentations; however, as the data were being reported it became evident that not all districts were aware of and understood the new requirements. This, in addition to the general difficulty in locating dropouts, may have contributed to the large number of “unknown” responses, as well as the large number of students who didn’t complete a full term or who worked less than 20 hours/week or 90 days.

The second year of data collection in conjunction with further communication with districts should show an increase in positive outcomes for students with disabilities in the future.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	Not applicable
2006-2007	Not applicable
2007-2008	Not applicable
2008-2009	Not applicable
2009-2010	Not applicable
2010-2011	A: 24.4% B: 46.9% C: 51.3%
2011-2012	A: 24.4% B: 46.9% C: 51.3%
2012-2013	A: 24.4% B: 46.9% C: 51.3%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
14.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10
14.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10
14.3 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10
14.4 Provide PD/TA to districts on data collection for this indicator.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education staff, Office of Data System Management staff, RPDC Consultants	New 2/11
14.5 Support implementation of Project Search to improve employment outcomes for students with disabilities	2011/12-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, Project Search Staff, KU Staff	New 2/11

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED.

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).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri is currently in the fifth year (2005-06) of a five-year monitoring cycle during which all school districts and responsible public agencies in the state are reviewed. Special Education monitoring is completed in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) district review and accreditation process. For a full description of the Special Education Monitoring system see http://www.dese.state.mo.us/divspeced/Compliance/MSIP/index.html. In brief, districts attend training and complete a Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) in the year prior to their scheduled MSIP review. The self-assessments are submitted to the Office of Special Education for a desk review by Office of Special Education staff. Staff uses the self-assessment results combined with other artifact data to determine which districts will receive an on-site monitoring. Some monitoring standards and indicators have been changed slightly during the cycle in response to findings from previous years, but the majority of the review has been consistent for this cycle. During the third cycle, performance standards have been monitored, in addition to standards and indicators covering procedural compliance.

Two main types of monitoring calls have been made during 3rd cycle reviews:

1) Procedural compliance - when findings of systemic non-compliance are made, districts are required to develop and implement corrective action plans. Districts are also required to correct any individual child non-compliance. Follow-up reviews are conducted approximately nine months from the date of the district's final report letter.
2) Performance Calls - districts are evaluated in regard to performance data, including, but not limited to, assessment, least restrictive environments, incidence rates, graduation and dropout rates. For each performance item indicated as "not met," the agency is instructed to include a plan to address the performance of students with disabilities in the agency's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and to also address performance for students with disabilities through the agency's annual special education program evaluation. An assurance statement must be provided to the DESE stating that the agency will develop and implement a plan to address these performance areas.

The Office of Special Education is currently making revisions to the monitoring system to coincide with the first year of the 4th cycle of MSIP (2006-07). The 4th cycle monitoring system will be a focused system which emphasizes data-based decisions surrounding performance for students with disabilities. Compliance standards and indicators most closely related to student performance will be reviewed, along with any other indicators selected by the State based upon identified statewide priority areas. The Office of Special Education is currently soliciting bids for a web-based monitoring data system which will allow districts to submit their Self-Assessments via the web, the State Agency to do both desk reviews and on-site monitoring via the web and for a comprehensive collection and reporting system for all monitoring data. See the Overview of the SPP on page 2 for information on the districts in each year of the 4th cycle.

Sanctions and Corrective Actions

The Missouri State Plan for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) states that "the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) may withhold, in part or whole, state and/or federal special and general education funds when a local education agency (LEA) is determined to be either unwilling or unable to provide FAPE. Such determination will be based on a LEA's refusal or failure to comply with a corrective action or hearing decision as ordered by the DESE in:

A. A monitoring report stemming from a monitoring for compliance with IDEA, Part B; or,
B. A child complaint decision in which the LEA has been found out of compliance; or,
C. A due process hearing decision of a state level hearing."

Missouri's State Plan for Special Education currently only refers to the one sanction of withholding funds. A more comprehensive system of sanctions will be implemented when DESE makes revisions to the state regulations implementing Part B of the IDEA in conjunction with the issuance of final federal regulations.

Until revisions to the state regulations are made, the sanction of withholding payments will follow the initiation of an enforcement action due to a failure to accomplish, in a timely manner, a corrective action resulting from a complaint decision or monitoring review. Enforcement actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Mandatory training for district personnel
- Mandatory use of state model forms
- Mandatory evaluations or reevaluation to address outdated, incomplete or inaccurate evaluations
- Mandatory IEP meetings to address procedural violations or non-delivery of services on the IEP
- Mandatory district plans to outline the steps and documentation a district will institute to correct non-compliance issues
- Mandatory recovery of funds to address the misappropriation of either state or federal funds
- Mandatory educational records review to address systemic issues
- Mandatory posting/public dissemination of State monitoring reports
- Mandatory reporting by district staff on a regular basis to local governing board on progress toward correcting identified non-compliance

In August of 2005, the Office of Special Education hired five regional special education compliance consultants that are housed in Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC) throughout the state. These consultants work directly with districts to assist them in understanding and effectively implementing procedural compliance, developing and implementing Corrective Action Plans resulting from a complaint decision or monitoring review and correcting procedural non-compliance in a timely manner.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A total of 98 districts and 9 charter schools were monitored during the 2003-04 school year, resulting in a total of 107 districts/agencies. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # Districts Reviewed 2003-04 – the number of districts/agencies reviewed on any of the topics
- # Districts with Findings – an unduplicated number of districts/agencies with one or more findings of noncompliance for each of the SPP Indicators
- # Findings in Districts 2003-04 – the total number of monitoring indicators 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

- # Corrected within 1 Year – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year
- % Corrected within 1 year –- the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year

Topic	# Districts Reviewed 2003-04	# Districts with Findings	# Findings in Districts 2003-04	# Corrected within 1 Year	% Corrected within 1 Year
1, 2, 13, 14: Graduation, Dropout, Transition Planning, Post-secondary outcomes (8 monitoring indicators)	107	36	105	70	66.7%
3. Assessments (15 indicators)	107	61	137	122	89.1%
4. Suspension/ expulsion (8 indicators)	104	20	35	31	88.6%
5, 6. School-age and ECSE Placements (9 indicators)	107	44	69	58	84.1%
7. EC Outcomes	New Indicator				
8. Parent Involvement	New Indicator				
9, 10: Disproportionality	New Indicator				
11. 60 Day Evaluation Timelines	New Indicator				
12. C to B Transition (3 indicators)	43	13	18	16	88.9%
Referral (3 monitoring indicators)	107	71	107	67	62.6%
IEP-Present level of performance (1 indicator)	107	54	54	28	51.9%
IEP-Measurable Goals (1 indicator)	107	63	63	32	50.8%
IEP-Special Education Services Identified (1 indicator)	107	40	40	33	82.5%
Services provided in accordance with IEP (1 indicator)	107	20	20	12	60.0%
Written notice for change in services (1 indicator)	103	34	34	21	61.8%
Eligibility-Learning Disability (1 indicator)	84	19	19	8	42.1%
Child Complaint Allegations			118	118	100%

Topic	# Districts Reviewed 2003-04	# Districts with Findings	# Findings in Districts 2003-04	# Corrected within 1 Year	% Corrected within 1 Year
Total			819	616	75.2%

The data above pertaining to corrective actions resulting from complaint investigations provides OSEP with a progress report on Missouri's steps to ensure that noncompliance identified in those decisions is corrected in a timely manner. DESE modified internal procedures to monitor the submission of corrective actions for child complaints in 2004-05. The data above verifies the implementation and effectiveness of the modified procedures. As directed on page 13 of the November 14, 2005 APR letter, DESE is considering this the final report on this matter.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Noncompliance related to SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

The 2003-04 findings for the monitoring priorities and indicators show that for most areas, over 80% of the findings were corrected within one year. Follow-up reviews have been conducted for all of the districts and charter schools with outstanding noncompliance after one year. An analysis of current data shows that 17 of the 107 districts/agencies reviewed during the 2003-04 school year continue to have outstanding noncompliance related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators. As of the date of this report, a specific analysis of the data shows the following number of districts and findings remain outstanding on each indicator:

SPP Indicators	Districts	Findings
1, 2, 13, 14	8	22
3	10	14
4	2	2
5, 6	4	7
12	2	2
Total*	17	47

* Total districts is an unduplicated number of districts with outstanding noncompliance

The following actions have been taken with the districts/charters demonstrating continued noncompliance related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

- All districts have been assigned to a special education regional compliance consultant and will have received a contact by January 15, 2006, to assist in the correction of noncompliance.
- Follow-up reviews are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2006.
- All districts have been advised that should they be unwilling or unable to correct outstanding areas of noncompliance by the date indicated, the DESE may initiate proceedings to invoke sanctions, including the withholding of state and/or federal funds

Noncompliance not related to SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

Baseline data for areas not related to the monitoring priorities and indicators show that only about 60 percent of the findings were cleared within one year of identification. Follow-up reviews have been conducted for all of the districts and charter schools with outstanding noncompliance after one year. An analysis of current data shows that 34 of the 107 districts/charter schools reviewed during the 2003-04 school year continue to have outstanding non-compliance in the specified areas with a total of 95 outstanding findings. As of the date of this report, a specific analysis of the data shows the following number of districts and findings remain outstanding on each indicator:

Topic	Districts	Findings
Referral	25	38
IEP—PLEP	16	16
IEP—Measurable Goals	23	23
IEP—Services identified	7	7
IEP—Services provided	6	6

Written Notice—Services	8	8
Eligibility—LD	11	11
Total	34	109

* Total districts is an unduplicated number of districts with outstanding noncompliance

The following actions have been taken with the districts/charters demonstrating continued noncompliance in areas not related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

- All districts have been assigned to a special education regional compliance consultant and will have received a contact by January 15, 2006, to assist in the correction of noncompliance.
- Follow-up reviews are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2006.
- All districts have been advised that should they be unwilling or unable to correct outstanding areas of noncompliance by the date indicated, the DESE may initiate proceedings to invoke sanctions, including the withholding of state and/or federal funds

Youth with disabilities in city and county jails:

In the DESE's June 27, 2005, final report to OSEP it was indicated that out of 20 districts originally out of compliance on the above issue, four districts remained non-compliant and that those districts had submitted to the DESE Corrective Action Plans assuring that they would have procedures in place within 12 months to ensure that they identify, and offer the provision of services to, students with disabilities under their jurisdiction incarcerated in local city/county jails. The DESE has subsequently monitored those four districts for compliance with this provision. Three of the districts have provided sufficient documentation that they do have adequate procedures in place to identify and offer the provision of services to students with disabilities under their jurisdiction incarcerated in local city/county jails. The one remaining district continues to be non-compliant in this area. In the interim, this district has been declared unaccredited by the State of Missouri and the operation of the district taken over by the State. Representatives of all Office of Special Educations of the DESE, including Special Education, have been assigned to this district to ensure that all State and federal standards and regulations are being met. The DESE special education compliance consultant in the St. Louis RPDC is working with this district to identify and develop a plan for correction of any noncompliance, including identification and provision of services to incarcerated youth.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
15.1 Provide IMPLEMENT a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
15.2 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
15.3 Manage General Supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Revised 2/10
15.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A child complaint may be filed by any individual or organization that believes there has been a violation of any state or federal regulation implementing the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined that the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by a staff member of the Office of Special Education. Decisions are issued by the Commissioner of Education within sixty (60) days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined that a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made.

In resolving a complaint in which it is found that a responsible public agency is out of compliance, the Department addresses within its decision how to remediate the compliance violation, including as appropriate, the awarding of monetary reimbursement or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the child; and appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities. If needed, technical assistance activities and negotiations are undertaken.

If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the part(s) of the complaint that are being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing.

If an issue is raised in a complaint that has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, the hearing decision is binding. A complaint alleging a school district's failure to implement a due process decision is resolved by DESE through the child complaint process.

Data are collected via a child complaint/due process database which alerts compliance staff to upcoming deadlines for resolution of child complaints as well as corrective actions so that timelines are adhered to.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Child Complaints

School Year	Total Filed	Total Decisions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions
2002-2003	166	150	3	0
2003-2004	154	145	23	0
2004-2005	107	90	5	0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

All complaints have had reports issued within 60-day timeline or within appropriately extended timelines.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
16.1 Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints.	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
16.2 Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.	2008/09-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Due Process Hearing System in the State of Missouri is a one-tier system consisting of a state-level, three-member Hearing Panel and a single Hearing Officer for Expedited Hearings in Part B. The Expedited Hearing Officers are attorneys under contract with the State of Missouri. The hearing panel is composed of two trained lay officers, one selected by each party, and a Hearing Chair who is an attorney on contract with the State of Missouri. Mediation at State expense is available to the parties both prior and subsequent to the filing of a request for a Due Process Hearing.

Missouri has made changes to State statutes to incorporate changes in the procedures for Due Process and Mediation made as a result of reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. The Procedural Safeguards Statement for Children and Parents has been revised to incorporate the provisions of the federal statute. State regulatory changes will be made when final federal regulations are issued.

All Hearing Chairs have been advised of the new requirements of the federal statute and changes have been made in the state data collection system to ensure collection of all relevant data regarding the Due Process and Mediation system. Districts and parents have been advised of the new requirements through dissemination of the Procedural Safeguards Statement for Children and Parents, SELS listserv messages, and IDEA 2004 trainings held throughout the state.

Data are collected via a child complaint/due process database which alerts staff to upcoming deadlines so that timelines are adhered to.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Due Process Hearing Requests

School Year	Total Due Process Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension
2002-2003	0
2003-2004	0
2004-2005	0

Discussion of Baseline Data:

All Due Process Hearings have been fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 16

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Data for the 2005-06 school year regarding resolution sessions will be collected through the revised Child Complaint/Due Process database maintained by the Office of Special Education. Jackie add description of new tracking procedures.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Resolution Sessions	32
Settlement Agreements	15
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data indicates that slightly less than half of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. As this was the first year for this new process, future trend data will allow evaluation of the usage and successes of resolution sessions.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	Not Applicable
2006-2007	50.0% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements
2007-2008	35.0%
2008-2009	35.1%
2009-2010	35.2%
2010-2011	35.3%
2011-2012	35.3%
2012-2013	35.3%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In

addition, indicator 18 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if resolution is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in resolution hearings. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
18.1 Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

See Indicator 17

Actual Target Data for 2006-2007:

Missouri did not meet the target for percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements. While we did not meet the target, it is significant that an increased number of mediations took place during this year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations	Percent with Agreements
2002-03	5	8	62.5%
2003-04	6	11	54.5%
2004-05*	8	13	61.5%

* 5 pending as of 11/7/05

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data show that the percent of mediations that result in a mediation agreement has been between 54% and 63% over the past three years.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005-2006	62.0% of mediations will result in mediation agreements
2006-2007	62.5%
2007-2008	35.0%
2008-2009	35.1%
2009-2010	35.2%
2010-2011	35.3%
2011-2012	35.3%
2012-2013	35.3%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:
The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In addition, indicator 19 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if mediation is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be investigated as a child complaint or heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in mediation. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
19.1 Provide information on the Missouri complaint system through the Parent's Guide to Special Education.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).

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).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri has reported all 618 data and annual performance reports by the due dates.

The state utilizes a web-based data collection system to collect data for the majority of the data collection required by Section 618 of IDEA. The Core Data Collection System contains screens which are used to collect data from districts. Districts are required to enter data as directed in the Core Data Collection System Manual within specified timelines.

The primary methods of facilitating accurate reporting by districts are as follows:

- Error checks and reports **-** Error checks have been incorporated into the web-based data collection system for invalid data reporting. If errors occur, an edit button will be displayed on the data entry screen. Error reports list the district and their respective reporting error(s). Data Coordination personnel review these reports for errors and notify districts accordingly. Re-verification of data ensures appropriate revisions have been made.
- Technical Assistance - Data Coordination provides training annually to school district personnel. Topics include, but are not limited to, reporting requirements and facilitating data integrity. New administrators learn how to enter required core data elements and understand the significance of the data for decision making at the local, state, and federal levels. Data Coordination also provides ongoing technical assistance to school district personnel relative to the web-based data collected for special education.
- Verification Procedures – Verification procedures are in place for each data collection. Edit checks are in place when districts enter data into the web-based collection system. Additional edit checks and year-to-year change checks occur when data is received by the Office of Special Education. All edits are resolved. Verification sheets and District Profiles provide data summaries covering multiple years are provided to districts. Data are being used to rank districts for focused monitoring and improvement planning purposes. Profiles are used as compliance staff review districts.

- Monitoring – The Compliance monitoring process used district-reported data when monitoring districts. Districts are evaluated on child count and placement data as well as exit data. During the monitoring process, if districts identify additional reporting errors, the corrections must be made before the compliance staff will consider the new data. Informal verification is done as the compliance staff is reviewing the district's Profile in conjunction with the monitoring reviews.

Missouri is implementing a student identification system in the spring of 2005. The ID system is expected to transition into a student information system in which there will be access to student level data on a statewide basis. At that point, we will develop a process of source document reviews to verify that data in the student level collection is accurate. The first set of student level information will be collected in 2005-06 and includes the data needed to pre-code state assessment student information forms. These data will include IEP status, disability and special education placement data. When available, these data will be checked against the December 1, 2005, special education child count and placement data for verification purposes.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

All 618 data and annual performance reports have been submitted on or before due dates.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Missouri strives to report data in a timely and accurate manner. Accuracy is assured through a variety of verification procedures as described above.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
All Years	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources	Status
20.1 Support the development and implementation of Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS)	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active Revised 2/10
20.2 Provide information to State Supervisors of Instruction and school administrators regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA	2005/06-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Staff	Active Revised 2/10
20.3 Develop and Manage web-based data system (FormHog) for management of contracts and data collection for statewide initiatives (SW-PBS, MIM, RtI and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD))	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff	Active New 2/10