

Missouri Part B

**State Performance Plan
for
2005-2006 through 2010-2011**

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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma..... 5

Indicator 2 – Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school..... 8

Indicator 3 – Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 10

 A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup..... 10

 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. 10

 C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. 10

Indicator 4 – Rates of suspension and expulsion: 15

 A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; 15

 B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. 15

Indicator 5 – Percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21:..... 19

 A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; 19

 B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or 19

 C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements..... 19

Indicator 6 – Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings)..... 21

Indicator 7 – Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: 23

 A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); 23

 B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and 23

 C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. 23

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. 26

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. 28

Indicator 10 – Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification..... 31

Indicator 11 – Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. 32

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. 33

Indicator 13 – Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. 35

Indicator 14 – Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school..... 36

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. . 37

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..... 43

Indicator 17 – Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. 45

Indicator 18 – Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements..... 46

Indicator 19 – Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements..... 47

Indicator 20 – State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate..... 48

ATTACHMENT 1..... 50

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

During the August 18-19, 2005, meeting of Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), staff from the Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 exit 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division of Special Education professional development initiatives relative to meeting performance goals and indicators as well as other non-Division professional development initiatives. There are four 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 Division 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 Division 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.

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 1 – Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

| |
|--|
| Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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 Divisions 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 | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Year | Students with Disabilities | | | All Students | | Gap (All – Spec Ed) |
| | Number of Graduates | Number of Graduates & Dropouts | Graduation Rate | Number of Graduates | Graduation Rate | |
| 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 Division of Youth Services (DYS) because these students were not included in reporting for all students.

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: $\text{Number of graduates} / (\text{number of graduates} + \text{number of dropouts}) \times 100$
- All Students Graduation Rate: $(\text{Graduates} / (9\text{-}12 \text{ Cohort Dropouts} + \text{Graduates})) \times 100$
- 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 |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 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 | <p>$(\text{Number of graduates} / (\text{number of graduates} + \text{number of dropouts})) \times 100$.</p> <p>Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead.</p> <p>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP</p> | <p>$(\text{Graduates} / (9\text{-}12 \text{ Cohort Dropouts} + \text{Graduates})) \times 100$</p> <p>Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level</p> <p>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP</p> |
| Dropout rate calculations | <p>$(\text{Number of dropouts} / \text{Total child count ages } 14\text{-}21) \times 100$. 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.</p> | <p>$(\text{Number of dropouts} / \text{average enrollment}) \times 100$</p> <p>Total dropouts is same as for students with disabilities</p> <p>Average enrollment is collected for all students</p> |

Department of Corrections (DOC) and Division 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 | 76.5% |
| 2009-2010 | 77.5% |
| 2010-2011 | 78.5% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Improve data collection in order to assess impact of services of career education and vocational rehabilitation | 2005-2011 | Division of Special Education Staff, Career Education, Vocational Rehabilitation |
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. See page 4. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |
| Develop and disseminate curriculum on high quality transition planning | 2006-07 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Career Education, VR |
| Encourage districts to offer the GED Option program | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, Career Education |
| Disseminate training on ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life | 2005-2011 | MPACT, Consultants, SIG, Vocational Rehabilitation |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2 – Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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 | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Year | Students with Disabilities | | | All Students | | Gap (All – Spec Ed) |
| | 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 Division 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 | 4.0% |
| 2009-2010 | 3.9% |
| 2010-2011 | 3.8% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 1 – Graduation Rates

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- 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.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = Number of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total number of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
 - b. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
 - d. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
 - e. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a.

- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
 - b. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
 - d. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
 - e. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a.

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 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 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 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.

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 Disabilities

| | 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.

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 will be revised in February/March 2006. The following targets will be revised accordingly.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets* |
|------------------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Percent of districts meeting AYP: CA – 21% Math – 61% Participation rate for children with IEPs: 100% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 39.8% Math – 32.1% |
| 2006-2007 | District AYP: CA – 22% Math – 62% Participation: 100% Proficiency: CA – 40.8% Math – 33.1% |
| 2007-2008 | District AYP: CA – 23% Math – 63% Participation: 100% Proficiency: CA – 59.2% Math – 54.2% |
| 2008-2009 | District AYP: CA – 24% Math – 64% Participation: 100% Proficiency: CA – 60.2% Math – 55.2% |
| 2009-2010 | District AYP: CA – 25% Math – 65% Participation: 100% Proficiency: CA – 61.2% Math – 56.2% |
| 2010-2011 | District AYP: CA – 26% Math – 66% Participation: 100% Proficiency: CA – 79.6% Math – 77.1% |

* Targets will be revised when standard setting is completed and the revised AYP goals are established.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|-----------------|--|
| Form and support electronic communities of practice focused on instructional practices for all educators | 2006-2011 | National Centers, web-based resources |
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |
| Disseminate training on appropriate accommodation decisions and usage | 2005-2011 | CCSSO materials, Consultants |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4 – Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year;
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = Number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by number of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Percent = Number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by number of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

DESE utilizes a web application for collecting disciplinary actions for all students in order to meet federal requirements for Gun Free Schools and IDEA, and state requirements for Safe Schools. Prior to 2005-06 school year, disciplinary actions 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 Division of Special Education reports to OSEP the number of children with disabilities who received disciplinary action. Beginning with the 2005-06 school year, the data collection was revised to collect every suspension and the number of days of removal for each.

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 Division 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.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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 Division 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.

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

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:

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.

Part B of this indicator is considered new. DESE does collect the race/ethnicity data for discipline incidents, so no change to data collections is needed. It is anticipated that a similar analysis will be used to identify significant discrepancies in discipline rates by race/ethnicity. Public reporting of data will include discipline rates by race/ethnicity for every district every year.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|--|
| 2005-2006 | 1.7% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates |
| 2006-2007 | 1.5% |
| 2007-2008 | 1.2% |
| 2008-2009 | 1.0% |
| 2009-2010 | 0.8% |
| 2010-2011 | 0.5% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Embed district analysis of policies, procedures and practices as a part of the Self-Assessment for monitoring and the Model Program Evaluation materials | 2005-2011 | Staff |
| Annual identification of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates | 2005-2011 | Staff, consultants |
| Review/revise definition of significant discrepancy when additional results of reviews of policies, procedures and practices are compiled | 2006-07 | Staff |
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |
| Develop and implement use of demonstration sites for PBS in order to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing rates of suspension and expulsion | 2005-2008 | PBS coaches, staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5 – Percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = Number of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- B. Percent = Number of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- C. Percent = Number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total number 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 | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Outside Reg Class <21% | 76,091 | 56.74% | 76,805 | 57.67% | 76,674 | 58.05% |
| Outside Reg Class 21-60% | 37,651 | 28.08% | 36,709 | 27.56% | 36,006 | 27.26% |
| Outside Reg Class > 60% | 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 Segregated | 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% |
| | | | | | | |
| National – Outside Regular < 21% | | 48.20% | | 49.90% | | n/a |
| National – Outside Regular > 60% | | 19.00% | | 18.50% | | n/a |
| National – Segregated Placements | | 4.03% | | 3.92% | | n/a |

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements. National data from ideadata.org

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.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|--|
| 2005-2006 | Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class < 21% of the day: 59% Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class > 60% of the day: 11.0% Percent of children with IEPs served in segregated settings: 3.50% |
| 2006-2007 | <21%: 60% >60%: 10.9% Other Settings: 3.45% |
| 2007-2008 | <21%: 61% >60%: 10.8% Other Settings: 3.40% |
| 2008-2009 | <21%: 62% >60%: 10.7% Other Settings: 3.35% |
| 2009-2010 | <21%: 63% >60%: 10.6% Other Settings: 3.25% |
| 2010-2011 | <21%: 64% >60%: 10.5% Other Settings: 3.20% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------|--|
| Encourage and support demonstration sites for Problem Solving, PBS, QED & RTI to reduce inappropriate referrals to special education | 2006-2011 | Consultants, National Centers |
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6 – Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

Measurement: Percent = Number of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Early Childhood Special Education in Missouri is fully funded through state and federal dollars and serves children ages 3-5 who are not kindergarten eligible. Missouri collects data on special education placements in such a way that 5 year olds in early childhood programs and 5 year olds in kindergarten can be separated. For state use, 5 year olds in kindergarten are included in school-age special education data, but for federal reporting, all five year olds must be reported in early childhood special education placements. Since most kindergarteners receiving special education services are in regular classrooms, the majority of the 5 year olds are cross-walked into the Early Childhood Setting placement. The baseline data below show the difference in percentages between the 3-PreKindergarten 5 group and the 3-5 group. Looking at the children in early childhood special education, the 3-PK5 group, placements appear to be much less integrated compared to national data. However, the Early Childhood Special Education setting for Missouri includes integrated programs that may have up to 50% nondisabled students in the classroom. Therefore, in reality ECSE children are more integrated across the state than the data reflect.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Early Childhood Special Education Placement Data

| | 2002-2003 Ages 3-PK5 | | 2003-2004 Ages 3-PK5 | | 2004-2005 Ages 3-PK5 | | 2004-2005 Ages 3-5 |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | % |
| Home | 362 | 3.6% | 437 | 4.0% | 219 | 2.0% | 1.5% |
| Early Childhood Setting | 1,755 | 17.5% | 1,895 | 17.4% | 1,552 | 14.3% | 32.7% |
| PT EC / PT ECSE Setting | 624 | 6.2% | 804 | 7.4% | 898 | 8.3% | 8.6% |
| Itinerant-Outside - Home | 2,273 | 22.6% | 2,867 | 26.3% | 3,142 | 29.0% | 20.8% |
| EC Special Education Set. | 4,915 | 49.0% | 4,743 | 43.5% | 4,892 | 45.1% | 34.9% |
| Separate School | 107 | 1.1% | 147 | 1.4% | 150 | 1.4% | 1.5% |
| Residential Facility | 5 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Total Early Childhood | 10,041 | 100.0% | 10,893 | 100.0% | 10,853 | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Sum of Home, Early Childhood Setting & PT/PT | | 27.3% | | 28.8% | | 24.6% | 42.8% |
| National (Ages 3-5) | | 53.5% | | 53.2% | | Not Available | Not Available |

Calculation: (# of children in placements with typically developing peers / total early childhood special education child count) X 100 where placements with typically developing peers includes placement categories: early childhood settings, home and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings.

Source: Missouri data from district-reported data on Screen 11 of Core Data. National data from ideadata.org

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The settings data provided above on children receiving special education services with typically developing peers do not include children served in integrated classrooms which can contain up to 50% non-disabled peers. Through recent discussions with the Early Childhood Partnership which is a group of early childhood program representatives, it is clear that more clarification and technical assistance is needed on the correct reporting of early childhood special education students who are served in classrooms with typically developing children. Clarification may shift some reporting from the Early Childhood Special Education setting to the Early Childhood setting.

Targets are being established on baseline data that do not include the 5 year old children in kindergarten since that is most representative of preschool programming in Missouri.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|---|
| 2005-2006 | 25.0% of preschool children with IEPs in settings with typically developing peers |
| 2006-2007 | 27.0% |
| 2007-2008 | 30.0% |
| 2008-2009 | 35.0% |
| 2009-2010 | 42.0% |
| 2010-2011 | 50.0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|-----------------|--|
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |
| Provide technical assistance on the definitions of the early childhood placement categories | Fall 2005-2011 | Staff, ECSE Partnership |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7 – Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

Measurement:

Separately for each of A, B and C:

- 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:
 - a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = Number of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = Number of preschool children who improved functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In order to begin collecting early childhood outcome data, Missouri implemented statewide observational assessments for children exiting early childhood special education programs in the spring of 2005. This assessment will provide a measure of functioning levels comparable with nondisabled peers at time of exit from early childhood programs; however the assessment will not provide enough information to meet the requirements of this new SPP Indicator.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education serves as the Lead Agency for Part C as well as Part B. In order to begin the process of gathering data on these specific early childhood outcomes, Missouri convened representatives from both the Part C and 619 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. Individuals participating represent all regions of the state, including urban, suburban and rural communities.

Beginning in November 2005 but no later than January 15, 2006, three models of determining early childhood outcomes will be piloted through June 2006 in a number of school districts/regions across the

state. This data will be reported to OSEP in February 2007. The three pilot models include determining early childhood outcomes through:

- Use of multiple sources of available data, and in some cases specific tools will be used as the assessment of choice. Such tools include the Dial, Brigance, Ages & Stages Questionnaire, and High Scope Child Observation Record
- Use of specific assessment tools (HELP and Ages & Stages Questionnaire)
- Development of a specific tool to rate OSEP-required outcomes based on the HELP and Brigance.

In all pilot sites, individuals currently conducting assessments will continue in this role. Each site will determine child outcomes through both the assignment of a functional age and use of a multipoint scale (3, 5 or 7 points) based on the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) scale. Collating data and determination of child outcomes are being piloted in three ways:

- Determination by existing evaluation or IFSP team
- Determined by tool (where tool is being developed for this sole purpose)
- Determined by administrator using a formula to convert data into a five point scale modified from the ECO Center scale.

Children participating in the pilot process will be determined using the following criteria:

- Child must have the potential for six or more months of service in the Part C or 619 program
- Child must enter the program on or after the date the site begins pilot procedures (i.e., pilot procedures will not be applied or "back-dated" for children who entered the program before its designated start date). Entry to the program is being piloted as the date the child is determined eligible for Part C or 619 services, and programs will have a 30 day window to determine the child's outcome level after this point.
- In large programs, a sample of evaluators will be included in the pilot process, and any child meeting the criteria above who is evaluated by those select individuals will be included in the pilot (e.g., Special School District of St. Louis County will train some of its evaluators in the process, and all the children they work with will be included in the pilot).

In March 2006, the workgroups will reconvene to recommend a statewide process to DESE based on an examination of:

- The extent to which each pilot process met stated principles (useful at local and state levels, simple/feasible, relevant to existing needs)
- The face validity of assigning children functional ages versus use of a multipoint scale to determine individual child outcomes
- Efficacy and efficiency of use.

At the March 2006 meeting, workgroup participants will help make final decisions about the process or instruments required for data submission, as well as recommend the procedure for statewide data collection. Subsequent to this meeting, the Missouri process for determining child outcomes will be finalized and prepared for dissemination and training in local Part C and 619 programs for implementation during the 2006-07 school year. Missouri plans to assess all children in Part C and 619 programs when fully implemented.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Data on the status at entry to early childhood special education, obtained during the pilot process described above will be reported in the February 2007 APR. Entry/exit (outcome) data and targets will be reported in the February 2008 APR for children who have received preschool special education services for six months or more.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See Overview of Issue

| | |
|------------------|--|
| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
| All Years | To be established in February 2008 APR |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| Determine data collection tools and measurement methods for pilot | Fall 2005 | Selected ECSE and Part C programs, NECTAC, staff |
| Conduct pilot implementation and data collection | January-June 2006 | Selected ECSE and Part C programs, NECTAC, staff |
| Evaluate pilot data collection and revise system accordingly | Spring/Summer 2006 | Selected ECSE and Part C programs, NECTAC, staff |
| Develop and deliver training and technical assistance statewide | Summer 2006 & ongoing | NECTAC, staff, consultants |
| Implement data collection and reporting statewide | Summer 2006 | Staff, consultants |
| Establish targets and improvement activities | February 2008 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8 – Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.html>. Previous Annual Performance Reports to OSEP have reported on the differences in reporting between parents of students with disabilities and all parents.

While many questions on the current parent survey address parent involvement and perceptions, none of the questions directly address this SPP indicator. The parent survey is currently being revised for use in the 4th cycle of MSIP by DESE School Improvement staff and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED). The Division is working with the MSIP staff and OSED to have question(s) added to the parent survey for 2006-07 that will address this SPP indicator. The revised survey will be field tested in the 2005-06 school year. Data will then be gathered from all districts in 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 district.

OSED 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.

The parent survey data were used in conjunction with the focused monitoring pilot during the 2004-05 school year. Data were discussed with school personnel, and together with parent interviews, began to build a picture of parent involvement for the district. Parent interviews will continue to be a part of focused monitoring procedures.

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 Division plans to collaborate with stakeholders to identify and promote successful models of parent involvement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new Indicator. Baseline data for 2005-06 from the field test of the MSIP parent survey will be reported in the February 2007 APR.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data will be collected through the MSIP parent survey as described above. Since these data will be gathered in conjunction with MSIP accreditation reviews, 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 |
|------------------|---|
| All Years | To be established in February 2, 2007 APR |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------------|---|
| Add question(s) to MSIP Parent Survey | Fall 2006 | Staff, DESE School Improvement Staff, OSEDA |
| Report baseline data, targets and improvement activities | February 2007 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9 – Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement: Percent = Number 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 number of districts in the State times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Districts that were identified with disproportionate representation that were completing Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessments during 2004-05 were required to complete a Disproportionality Survey. These surveys are being used as districts are reviewed during the 2005-06 school year. The survey asks whether districts analyze disaggregated data, about referral and evaluation procedures, training for IEP teams and dissemination of data. Preliminary results show that districts have policies and training in place for staff regarding racial/ethnic considerations in referral processes and eligibility determinations. Most districts are looking at data regarding referral and identification of students by race; however, very few districts share demographic information about the racial make-up of special education students to parents and staff. These surveys will be used when making compliance calls during the 2005-06 monitoring reviews.

The Division is creating an addendum to the program evaluation model to examine policies, procedures and practices related to disproportionality and eligibility determinations. This may incorporate the Disproportionality Survey discussed above along with additional resources and professional development that incorporate information on disproportionality (See <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/EffectivePractices/dispro.html>). Data from the disproportionality data sheets that are included in the district profiles will be a resource for the program evaluation.

Targeted technical assistance is available to districts through the RPDC consultants in developing and implementing improvement plans or corrective actions. Professional development modules that address disproportionality include Quality Eligibility Determinations, Problem Solving and Least Restrictive Environments.

Districts with identified disproportionality will be required to complete the program evaluation addendum regarding that topic. 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.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new Indicator. Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 APR. For this indicator, statewide SPP data will be the number of districts identified for which overall special education data was disproportionate and a determination of inappropriate identification was made.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In previous Annual Performance Reports, a variety of factors were reviewed to identify disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Statewide, the most significant areas of disproportionality have been over-representation of Black students in the disability categories of Mental Retardation, Emotional Disturbance and Specific Learning Disabilities and in the placement category of Self-Contained (outside regular class greater than 60% of the time). Based on this, the APRs reported on Missouri’s examination of data at a district level which focused on the following:

- Over-representation of Black students in Special Education
- Over-representation of Black students in the disability category Mental Retardation
- Over-representation of Black students in the disability category Emotional Disturbance
- Over-representation of Black students in the disability category Specific Learning Disabilities
- Over-representation of Black students in the placed outside regular education greater than 60% of the time (primarily self-contained settings)

For each of the five categories, a determination of disproportionality was made if all three of the following were found to be true:

- Statistical significance based on a z-test ($p < 0.05$)
- Significance based on a “P + 10% of P” criteria
- A minimum of 10 students in the category

The number of disproportionate categories was then determined for each district, resulting in a range of 0 to 5 disproportionate categories.

The method described above results in an overall determination of disproportionality for each district that combines overall disproportionality with disproportionality in specific disability and placement categories. Indicators 9 and 10 for this State Performance Plan require separate determinations of disproportionality, one overall (Indicator 9) and one for specific disability categories (Indicator 10).

For this new SPP indicator 9 and the following indicator 10, Missouri will continue to use the same procedures described above, but will add in additional disability categories speech/language impairment, other health impairment and autism to cover the requirements of Indicator 10. This will result in a possible range of 0-8, rather than the existing 0-5. After evaluating this analysis, the number of categories will be determined for which a district will be considered disproportionate, and a determination of inappropriate identification will be made for each of those districts based on review of policy, procedure and practices.

District profiles include special education disability and placement data by race. Public reporting of data will include special education child count by race compared to enrollment by race for every district every year.

| 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 |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|
| Review/revise existing procedures for identification of districts and the review of district procedures, practices and policies. | 2005-06 | Staff, contractor |
| Implement revised review process | 2005-2011 | Staff, contractor |
| Identify training and technical assistance resources and post on web | 2005-06 | Staff, contractor |
| Include district analysis of policies, procedures and practices as a part of the Self-Assessment and Model Program Evaluation materials | 2006-07 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

Measurement: Percent = Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by number of districts in the State times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

See Indicator 9

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be reported in February 2007 Annual Performance Report. For this indicator, statewide SPP data will be the number of districts identified for which data in the specified disability categories were disproportionate and a determination of inappropriate identification was made.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See Indicator 9. District profiles include special education disability and placement data by race. Public reporting of data will include special education child count by disability and race compared to enrollment by race for every district every year.

| 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 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11 – Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.

Measurement:

- a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. Number determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. Number determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Missouri monitors for evaluation timelines through the special education compliance reviews; however, the data collected does 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 Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) the year prior to the 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 can 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 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be reported in February 2007 Annual Performance Report

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 beginning with SEMSAs conducted during 2005-06.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|---|
| All Years | 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated and have eligibility determined within 60 days |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|---------------|-----------|
| Develop data collection and include in SEMSA | December 2005 | Staff |
| Analyze data from first year and develop improvement activities | Summer 2006 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12 – Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Measurement:

- a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Percent = c divided by a – b 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 | 321 |
| • Referred & found eligible & IEP in place by third birthday | 39 |
| • Referred & found eligible by third birthday, IEP in place at start of school | 52 |
| • Late referrals from Part C, but Eligibility and IEP timely | 31 |
| • Parent delays | 443 |
| Total | |
| 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 |
|---|-------------|--|
| Determine best method for State/Part C notification to LEAs of First Steps children who are potentially eligible for ECSE on or before child’s 30 month | Spring 2006 | Staff |
| Finalize and disseminate Part C to B Transition Module for early intervention and early childhood staff | 2005-06 | Staff, SPOE and ECSE partnership, SIG |
| Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans. | 2005-2011 | SIG, Consultants |
| Identify evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator | 2005-2011 | Staff, Consultants, National Centers, Other states |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13 – Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Measurement: Percent = Number of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by number of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

While compliance monitoring reviews address secondary transition, data have 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 will complete a SEMSA during 2005-06 that will collect data on transition plans. Districts will be trained on the use of the SEMSA which will include a series of probing questions developed as a part of the focused monitoring pilot to lead districts to a determination of whether a transition plan would reasonably enable a student to meet the post-secondary goals. Districts will review a representative sample of files based on race, gender and disability. 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.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new Indicator. Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 Annual Performance Report.

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 youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Indicator 1 – Graduation

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14 – Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

Measurement: Percent = Number of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by number of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary 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 more than five years. Post-graduation follow-up data for students with disabilities is collected and reported as part of this system that is a requirement for all school districts. These data are used in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) for district accreditation purposes as well as in monitoring for Special Education. Missouri has requested permission from OSEP to continue using this system, since the follow-up collection does not meet all requirements for this SPP indicator in that the follow-up is done at six months post-graduation, and it does not include dropouts. In order to obtain follow-up data on dropouts, Missouri has two options, one to modify the graduate follow-up collection to include dropouts; another to utilize information gained through state mandated reporting for all dropouts (disabled and non-disabled) to a Dropout Hotline when follow-up contacts are made to each dropout.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be reported in the February 2008 Annual Performance Report or sooner, based upon OSEP's response to Missouri's request to continue using the existing post-graduate follow-up.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data will be collected as described above with the addition of follow-up data for dropouts. Post-secondary follow-up data have been reported in the Special Education District Profile for several years and is used to make a performance call during monitoring reviews. Public reporting of data will include follow-up information for students with disabilities for every district every year. Comparable data for all students are available publicly on DESE's website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|--|
| All Years | To be established in February 2008 APR |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|------------------|------------|
| Meet with internal DESE Divisions to determine best method for collection of dropout data | Winter 2005/2006 | DESE staff |
| Modify data collection procedures | 2006-07 | Staff |
| Notify districts of procedures | 2006-07 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15 – General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. Number of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.
 - b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
- Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. Number of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.
- b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. Number of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.
- b. Number of findings of noncompliance made.
- c. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = c divided by b times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

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 Division of Special Education for a desk review by Division 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 Division 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 Division 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 Division 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

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification

| SPP Indicator | # 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% |
| Total | | | 364 | 297 | 81.6% |

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification

| Topic | # Districts Reviewed 2003-04 | # Districts with Findings | # Findings in Districts 2003-04 | # Corrected within 1 Year | % Corrected within 1 Year |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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% |
| Total | | | 337 | 201 | 59.6% |

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification

| Child Complaint Allegation Topic | # Findings in 2003-04 | # Corrected within 1 Year | % Corrected within 1 Year |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Discipline | 5 | 5 | 100% |
| Eligibility Determination | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| Evaluations | 25 | 25 | 100% |
| FERPA | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| IEP | 49 | 49 | 100% |
| Placement | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| Provision of Notice | 14 | 14 | 100% |
| Referral | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| Special Education and Related Services | 11 | 11 | 100% |
| Transfer Procedures | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| Transition | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| Total | 118 | 118 | 100% |

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 divisions 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 |
|--|-------------|--------------------|
| Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies procedural noncompliance • Corrects identified noncompliance in a timely manner • Focuses on performance of students with disabilities • Includes a system of rewards and sanctions | 2005-2011 | Staff, NCSEAM |
| Implement targeted technical assistance that will enable districts to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectively and efficiently meet compliance requirements • Progress toward meeting the targets for student performance in the SPP | 2005-2011 | Staff, consultants |
| Implement a regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans | 2005-2011 | Staff, consultants |
| Contract for web-based monitoring management system | Spring 2006 | LA staff |
| Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes | Summer 2006 | LA staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16 – Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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, Division 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 Division 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 |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines | 2005-2011 | Staff |
| Continue to conduct and analyze participant satisfaction/feedback surveys | 2005-2011 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17 – Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source:

Data collected on Attachment 1.

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 Division.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be reported in the February 2007 Annual Performance Report.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See above

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|------------------|--|
| All Years | To be established in February 2007 APR |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Revise database to capture data on resolution sessions | Fall 2005 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source:

Data collected on Attachment 1.

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

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% |
| 2006-2007 | 62.5% |
| 2007-2008 | 63.0% |
| 2008-2009 | 63.5% |
| 2009-2010 | 64.0% |
| 2010-2011 | 64.5% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Develop mediation survey and begin data collection | 2006-2011 | Staff |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, 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 (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

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 Division. 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 are reviewing the district's Profile in conjunction with the monitoring reviews.

Missouri is implemented 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 |
|--|-------------|--|
| Access MOSIS/assessment precode data and compare to child count data | Spring 2006 | Staff, DESE Division of School Improvement |
| Continue involvement with development of Missouri's Student Information System | 2005-2011 | DESE staff |

ATTACHMENT 1

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

| SECTION A: Signed, written complaints | |
|---|-----|
| (1) Signed, written complaints total | 107 |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued | 90 |
| (a) Reports with findings | 59 |
| (b) Reports within timeline | 85 |
| (c) Reports within extended timelines | 5 |
| (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed | 16 |
| (1.3) Complaints pending | 1 |
| (a) Complaint pending a due process hearing | 1 |

| SECTION B: Mediation requests | |
|---|----|
| (2) Mediation requests total | 18 |
| (2.1) Mediations | |
| (a) Mediations related to due process | 13 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 8 |
| (b) Mediations not related to due process | 0 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 0 |
| (2.2) Mediations not held (including pending) | 5 |

| SECTION C: Hearing requests | |
|--|-----|
| (3) Hearing requests total | 86 |
| (3.1) Resolution sessions | N/A |
| (a) Settlement agreements | N/A |
| (3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) | 7 |
| (a) Decisions within timeline | 0 |
| (b) Decisions within extended timeline | 7 |
| (3.3) Resolved without a hearing | 62 |

| SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision) | |
|--|-----|
| (4) Expedited hearing requests total | 3 |
| (4.1) Resolution sessions | N/A |
| (a) Settlement agreements | N/A |
| (4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated) | 0 |
| (a) Change of placement ordered | 0 |

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to department programs may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Title IX Coordinator, 5th Floor, 205 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0480; telephone number 573-751-4581.