Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™

Office of Special Education

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART B
2010–11

Submitted January 28, 2011
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development 1

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma 12

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school 20

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 22
- A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup 22
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs 22
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. 22

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion: 27
- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and 27
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. 27

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: 32
- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 32
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 32
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 32

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: 35
- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and 35
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 35

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: 36
- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); 36
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and 36
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)) 36

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. 40

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. 45

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. 49

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. 52

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. 57

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the

student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. 61

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: 64

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. 64

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. . 64

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school..... 64

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. ... 68

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. 74

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. 76

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. 78

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 80

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 82

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2010–11 (Federal Fiscal Year 2010 which covers the time period from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011).

Development of the Annual Performance Report (APR)

Process Used to Develop the APR
Staff from the Compliance and Effective Practices sections of the Office of Special Education, staff from the Data Coordination section of the Office of Data System Management and staff from the Special Education Funds Management section of the Division of Financial and Administrative Services met regularly throughout the year to review and analyze data related to State Performance Plan (SPP) targets to determine whether SPP improvement activities are being implemented and are effective in helping the state meet its targets. Tools such as the OSEP SPP/APR Calendar are used to help the workgroup structure its activities, and an internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities was also developed and is used regularly as a management tool.

Stakeholder input is also crucial, and a draft of the APR and proposed SPP changes in targets and improvement activities are presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE) prior to submission for their review and input.

Data Collection and Reporting

Public Reporting of District Data CHECK ON THIS BEFORE REPORT IS SENT TO OSEP!
Public reports of 2010–11 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website under School Data and Statistics at dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district.

Public Reporting of Statewide Data CHECK ON THIS BEFORE REPORT IS SENT TO OSEP!
The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the Department website at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a special education listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

MOSIS and Core Data
The Department began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007–08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS). Prior to that, the Core Data Collection System (a web-based data collection system with interactive edits) was used to gather data from districts. MOSIS includes a variety of edit checks which help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 14.

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

other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

Data Team Training
During the 2010-11 school year the Department partnered with the Leadership and Learning Center to train SEA and LEA staff in a Decision Making for Results (DMR) process to be used throughout the state. The data team training demonstrates how to implement data-driven decision making at the classroom-practitioner level. Data teams provide a structure for teachers to specifically identify areas of student need and collaboratively decide on the best instructional approach in response to those needs. This process assists schools and districts across Missouri in indentifying successful teaching and leadership practices that serve as measureable indicators within an effective holistic accountability system. In the 2010–11 school year, 14 Special Education and Compliance Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants were certified as official data team trainers.

Systems Administration and Monitoring

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

Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators
The Department began the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006–07. MSIP is the state's general school accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Office of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most self assessment activities that are required of districts by the Office of Special Education are based on the SPP indicators and whether the district met threshold levels related to the targets established in the SPP. If, during their MSIP review year, a district did not meet a performance threshold, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to any performance area not met.

In addition to a focused file review, the Office of Special Education requires a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, the Office of Special Education collects data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitors for compliance in these areas.

Corrective action plans are required for all identified noncompliance and any findings of noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. In order to verify correction of noncompliance, additional data is requested as part of a follow-up review. This data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and districts may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified. Districts must also correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days of the receipt of the report of findings. Compliance Supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services or evaluations completed) have been put in place.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of IMACS and frequent contact with the districts by Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants and Department Supervisors. When districts attend the required self-assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance, they are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months.

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

Onsite Reviews

Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004–05 and 2005–06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). In 2010–11, nine districts were selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)). Based upon the data, two of the nine districts were identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, five of the nine districts were identified in only the area of elementary achievement and two of the nine districts were identified in only the area of post secondary transition. Data analysis by Department staff and RPDC Consultants occurred prior to the review, and a hypothesis was developed to identify root causes of the district's areas in need of improvement. While onsite, the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered was reviewed by the team and used to support or deny the hypothesis. Exit conferences were held with district staff to report the team's findings and answer any questions from the districts.

Within six weeks of the review, the districts received reports of the onsite review which included a corrective action plan, when necessary. The districts were required to report on activities related to the areas identified through an Improvement Plan and subsequent activity reports.

The Office of Special Education's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used by the Department Office of Quality Schools for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006–2007 school year. The MSIP and the special education onsite reviews, which are aligned and complement each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both an MSIP and special education monitoring review.

Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide

Improvement planning is used for both improvement grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans was developed that functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for special education monitoring purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on the Department's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of IMACS and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGs).

The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors the Department will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for identified performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of

the needs assessment. Identified areas in need of improvement are addressed through objectives and strategies.

Monitoring Process for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)
CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA may not use more than 15% of the amount the agency receives under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced by the agency under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. Districts using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through 1) ePeGs on the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), starting with the 2008–09 FER, and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER. Both the RVS and Part B FER are due September 30 each year.

Districts that provide CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the FER:

- Professional development provided to teachers and other school staff
- Detail of what educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction was provided
- Number of students who received CEIS using IDEA Part B funds who were not eligible for IDEA services at the time they received these services from the district during the school year
- Of the students who had IEPs during this school year, report the number that had received CEIS using IDEA funds anytime in the past two school years

Districts that provide CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the CEIS RVS:

- Date the CEIS activity occurred
- Description of the CEIS activity that occurred
- Cost of the CEIS activity
- Titles of all participants that attended the activity (i.e. 4th Grade Reading Teacher)
- Number of Special Education Students served by the CEIS activity (this number should be zero as CEIS is for students without an IEP)
- Funding source to verify that districts are not supplanting with CEIS funds
- Group(s) benefiting from the CEIS activity

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by the CEIS committee, a cross-sectional committee consisting of a staff member from the Compliance, Special Education Finance, Effective Practices and Data Coordination sections.

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

Program Development

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

Grants were awarded in 2010–11 in the area of Elementary Achievement to 78 schools to be implemented in the 2011–12 school year. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Co-Teaching, Check and Connect, Differentiated Instruction (DI), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) and Aimsweb.

In addition, 49 grants were awarded for improvement in post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities for that year. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Transition Outcome Project (TOP), Co-teaching, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Wilson Reading, Differentiated Instruction (DI), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Check and Connect, Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM), High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Aimsweb.

2010–11Special Education Improvement Grant Activities	
Districts that Attended Fall 2010 RPDC Training	145
Letters of Intent Submitted by Trained Districts	104 or 71.7%
Letters of Intent Submitted by ALL Districts	192
Grant Applications Received by Trained Districts	84 or 57.9%
Grant Applications Received by ALL Districts	154
Grant Applications Approved by Trained Districts	55 or 65.5%
Grant Applications Approved by Non-Trained Districts	37 or 52.9%
Grant Applications Denied by Trained Districts	29 or 34.5%
Grant Applications Denied by Non-Trained Districts	33 or 47.1%

Overall, 94 successful districts were awarded 78 elementary achievement and 49 secondary transition grants in 2010–11 to be implemented during the 2011–12 school year. Grants continue to fund professional development to support the implementation of systems change initiatives.

Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)

The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed for an effective learning environment are in place for all students.

The SW-PBS initiative is comprised of the following personnel:

- State Coordinator
- Assistant State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- Secondary/Tertiary Consultants (5)
- Regional Consultants (24)

The State Coordinator guides the implementation of a statewide system of SW-PBS technical assistance for Missouri. Efforts primarily focus on directing the daily activities of the initiative and on providing ongoing training and technical assistance to MO SW-PBS staff. The Assistant State Coordinator supports the State Coordinator in implementing Missouri's statewide system of SW-PBS. This position is primarily charged with revising the current Scope and Sequence for training across all three tiers and for collaborating with Regional Consultants to ensure the training content aligns with the Scope and Sequence. Revisions to the training content are supervised by the Assistant State Coordinator as well.

The Data/Web Consultant is in the process of formalizing a cohesive system of MO SW-PBS data collection available for review at building, district, and state levels. This position also develops data training curriculum that is presented to MO SW-PBS staff and school district personnel. In addition, the Data/Web Consultant offers statewide support through postings of various resources on the MO SW-PBS website. The Secondary/Tertiary Consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for districts/buildings that have met criteria at the universal level. These Consultants also train Regional Consultants to offer implementation assistance at these tiers. The Regional Consultants provide building- and district-level support across a spectrum of implementation issues.

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at building, district, regional and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the OSEP-funded Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports National Center located at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The MO SW-PBS initiative has expanded from 275 buildings in 2006 to 700 buildings in 2011 at the elementary and secondary levels, with the greatest growth occurring at the secondary level. Data collected through the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and the state-developed MO SW-PBS School Data Profile (housed within the FormHog interface), along with other Department data sources, indicate that districts/buildings participating in the state SW-PBS initiative have shown improvements in student attendance, student achievement and placement in the least restrictive environment.

Active MO SW-PBS buildings are categorized into an implementation phase based on established criteria. The categories include Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver and Gold. In June 2011, 244 buildings were recognized for having met the criteria for Bronze, Silver or Gold levels. These buildings qualify as state demonstration sites that share data and information on implementation of MO SW-PBS with the state as well as other schools. Additional information regarding SW-PBS, including schools serving as demonstration sites, may be accessed at pbismissouri.org.

Response to Intervention (RtI)

Past Department school improvement efforts focused on three-tiered models of intervention as an effective and efficient organizational framework to facilitate systems change. To further align practices within these models, school improvement staff is developing a single improvement framework using a comprehensive data collection and decision-making process. The following updates work related to RtI completed over the past year.

Missouri Alignment Group

As part of the development of a single improvement model, the Missouri Alignment Group, comprised of Department staff representing RtI, SW-PBS, Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM), was formed to continue and further communication as well as promote alignment among the tiered intervention models that currently exist in Missouri. This group meets monthly to discuss a variety of issues related to the three-tiered model work (data collection, shared learning opportunities, curriculum, model updates etc.).

RTI Training Modules

Three comprehensive RtI training modules developed by the National Center on Response to Intervention are currently being revised to meet Missouri's professional development needs. The modules are being revised with feedback from the RPDC Improvement and Compliance Consultants. Missouri's RtI Development Site Coordinator Dr. Rebecca Holland is using the feedback to better reflect Missouri's vision. The modules are slated for completion and use during the 2012–2013 school year in schools implementing RtI. Regional technical assistance staff are currently using portions of the module material in their training/PD activities.

RTI KnowledgeBase

Art Gross of Northrop Grumman, a technology partner of Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center (MC^3), led a workgroup which completed and released the RTI KnowledgeBase in September, 2011 (mc3edsupport.org/rti/). This workgroup was comprised of various technical assistance center and state education agency staff from a number of states, including Missouri. This online resource supports educators in understanding and implementing the RtI model, which provides an easy-to-access central point of information for educators. Rather than being simple lists of resources related to a broad topic, the RTI KnowledgeBase provides expert-selected resources through a process outline. The RTI KnowledgeBase divides a topic into elements, activities and tasks, with resources found at the task level.

The RTI KnowledgeBase is divided into the three stages of implementation identified by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). The first stage is exploration which considers the essential components of RtI models and the district or school's readiness to implement an RtI model with fidelity. The second stage, installation, requires a district or school to select an RtI model and to

put in place the supports necessary for implementing the essential components. These supports can include staff training, policies, implementation guides, forms, assessments, instructional programs and software. The third stage, initial implementation, puts the essential components into practice. Initial implementation can involve just a few components or teachers, and then expand over time. When the majority of teachers are implementing all components of RtI with fidelity, the district or school is in the final stage called full implementation. The RTI KnowledgeBase is geared primarily toward those in the exploration and installation stages, with some resources for those in the initial implementation stage.

While the RTI KnowledgeBase was developed as part of an objective to enhance the Department's capacity to disseminate information on RtI, the information is equally applicable throughout the region and nation.

RtI Development Sites
The Department identified twelve buildings within five Missouri school districts to participate in RtI development site work. These buildings represent a range from pre-K to secondary grade levels. These development site districts contribute to the Department's understanding of RtI implementation by school districts across the state. The development sites receive resources and expertise from the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI), Dr. Holland, the South Central RPDC and the Department. In return, the development sites provide feedback and recommendations regarding RtI implementation. Dr. Holland, a previous NCRTI technical assistance liaison, provides technical assistance to the five sites, as well as development of professional development modules, overall project data coordination and evaluation.

The main outcome of the project is to advance planning and implementation of RtI by capturing lessons learned from the sites, creating resources that support the sites in their varying stages of implementation and creating guidance documentation for other Missouri schools implementing or planning to implement RtI. The guidance and resources resulting from the project will be disseminated through RPDCs to support schools and districts implementing RtI.

Early Childhood RtI
To address the need to include early childhood in the state's RtI model, a partnership is being developed with the Juniper Gardens Children's Project/Center for Response to Intervention in Early Childhood (CRTIEC), (crtiec.org), in which assessment and intervention for preschool children will be piloted in Missouri schools. The RTI development site coordinator will coordinate this work with two of the early childhood programs within the development sites focusing on the essential components of RtI. Researchers at CRTIEC have developed a screening and progress monitoring system and tier 2 literacy interventions focused on vocabulary, comprehension and phonemic awareness. They have thus far primarily administered the assessments and implemented the interventions using research team staff. They are now ready to scale this up to the next level by training some practitioners to implement the assessments and interventions.

Secondary RtI
Dr. Jenny Scala presented on RtI at the Secondary Level May 4, 2011 in Jefferson City to RPDC Consultants (Improvement, Compliance, SW-PBS, PLC and MIM Implementation Facilitators) as well as some RPDC Directors. This presentation was in response to RPDC Consultant requests for additional professional development on RtI at the secondary level. This information is posted on the three-tiered model website. Discussions are ongoing with RPDC Improvement and Compliance Consultants on how best to package and use this information with districts.

Guidance Document
The original purpose of the RtI Guidance Document was to provide an overview of Missouri RtI and communicate Missouri's conceptual framework of the academic RtI model. The document is divided into five sections that highlight critical areas of RtI implementation. Section I explains the purpose of the guidance document and Missouri's conceptual RtI framework. Section II explains the four foundational elements necessary to support system change. Sections III and IV describe the essential

components of RtI that relate to curriculum, instruction and assessment. Section V puts all of the necessary pieces together to show how RtI complements other three-tiered models of intervention and works as a comprehensive framework to create educational environments responsive to the needs of all students. The final portion of this document includes a glossary and implementation resources.

Within the context of Missouri's Top 10 by 20 Plan, it is likely that three-tiered model work will be integrated across initiatives and incorporated into a single school improvement process. Should this happen, this document may be modified to provide written guidance on how the integrated, tiered model work is incorporated into a single improvement process.

Higher Education Collaborative
Drs. Dan Reschly and Susan Smartt presented to the Missouri Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) in April 2010 to promote awareness about the use of evidence-based practices within tiered models of intervention. The intent of the presentation was to encourage MACTE to request a repository of resources to assist the University of Central Missouri's (UCM's) College of Education in providing accurate and current content to pre-service teachers; however, this effort did not result in the desired outcome.

During the 2011–12 school year, this work has received renewed interest through a small pilot project directly affiliated with the UCM. Dr. Holland is currently developing a higher education RtI collaborative project at UCM involving teacher preparation faculty from general education, special education, RPDC Consultants and the Department to explore and document RtI implementation-related needs of early career teachers and higher education faculty. It is hoped that this work can be replicated in other Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) in the State.

Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)]
Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education in 2007, Missouri has been researching, developing and implementing an integrated three-tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes 11 essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, RtI and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. Districts spent 2008–09 planning and preparing and began implementation in 2009–10. In addition to continuing to implement the model in the original pilot buildings, nine of the 14 districts scaled up to additional buildings in the district during the 2010–2011 school year. The scaled-up buildings included three elementary buildings, three middle schools and five high schools. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. Evaluation results will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at mimschools.org.

Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech (Tts) Pilot
During 2010–11, the Enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. The project utilizes technology rich classrooms; text-to-speech software; and ongoing professional development to support and increase student achievement. The eMINTS technology rich classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation; SmartBoard and projector; scanner, printer and digital camera; multiple student computers; and specific software. Teachers participated in training in the use of the text-to-speech software and introductory exposure to other types of assistive technology. During the 2008–09 school year, technology was upgraded in the eMINTS classrooms and the Special Education classrooms received the eMINTS technology package. In 2010–11, professional development project materials were evaluated and revised to include not only a participant (teacher) version but also a facilitator version for the district eMints instructional specialist (eIS) who successfully completes RPDC training to then train teachers within the district. The facilitator version was expanded to include additional resources and

references for district eIS to refresh on assistive technology. A full-day training was held on December 8, 2010 for all participating district eIS members. Webinars were also held for additional project implementation support, and additional support was provided directly to schools via phone.

In 2010–11, 18 new Missouri districts were invited to participate in the eMints program. Of those, six districts with 11 schools accepted the invitation. The eMINTS4All professional development program and the full complement of eMINTS4All technology resources were added for student use in these classrooms. Collaborative opportunities fostered the creation of a shared knowledge base between general and special educators on the use of technology and TtS software. Current eMINTS/eMINTS4All teachers and special educators received training in the selection and use of appropriate assistive technology to achieve goals for students with disabilities. Overall, 82 new teachers and seven new eIS members participated in eMints in 2010–11, reaching 2,873 students. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the project.

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) Project
To address student dropout data, a comprehensive school change process that includes professional development, data-based decision-making, collaboration, action planning, and technical assistance was implemented targeting schools with a dropout rate higher than the state average (4.3% in 2008–09). In 2009–10, Missouri partnered with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention strategies in high schools and middle feeder schools in eight communities representative of the state (urban/rural, small/medium/large). NDPC-SD provided six days of on-site training for district personnel. NDPC-SD facilitated school's efforts using data to identify risk factors for dropout and helped identify suitable interventions to address those factors. School dropout prevention teams created action plans to be implemented during the 2010–11 school year. Data submitted during the 2010–11 school years by participant schools included retention rates, disciplinary infractions, academic failures and monthly attendance rates. The NDPC-SD also provided three one day booster sessions during the 2010–11 school years to support areas targeted in the action plans. Missouri applied for and received intensive technical assistance from the National Dropout Prevention Center for the 2011–12 school year. This will provide for the addition of new cohorts of model schools and continuing support for the model schools in cohort 1.

The cohort 1 sites have concentrated efforts toward monitoring attendance, failing grades, behavior and increasing school engagement. Preliminary data and anecdotal evidence suggest a positive impact on student performance and school policies, procedures and practices related to student retention and re-entry. Model sites achieved a 9.8% reduction in dropouts for the 2010–11 school year. One model district reported the lowest number of freshman D and F grades in the history of the school. Another district reported changed school policy with regard to tardies because of the belief that the method currently used penalized students and resulted in failure and eventual dropout.

Transition Outcomes Project (TOP)
The Transition Outcomes Project (TOP) was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) with support from OSEP. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Empowers local school offices of special education to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs and approaches.

The Department contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide TOP training to Department staff, RPDC transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training. During the 2008–2009 school year, 60 districts participated in the TOP training. Of these, 30 were new to the TOP process when they attended training. These 30 TOP districts analyzed IEPs from their district, reported

this information to all secondary special education staff in their district, and developed an action plan to improve transition planning and services. The other 30 districts were in their follow-up year when they re-evaluated IEPs from their district to identify gains in Indicator 13 compliance.

In the 2009–10 school year, an additional 30 districts were added to the project and 50 districts were added during the 2010–11 school year. This represents 15% of the districts in the state. Each year, Regional Professional Development Centers provide TOP training to participating districts in varying stages of implementation. This training includes assisting district teams in conducting IEP reviews, analyzing results, reporting Indicator 13 data to district staff, developing and implementing action plans, and conducting follow-up IEP reviews. Additional districts will be added during each school year with the goal of having all districts in the state trained and implementing the TOP.

As a part of the TOP, Missouri also utilizes the web-based CuttingEdj database. This website allows educators to review and track IEPs for compliance with Indicator 13. It allows districts to see the number of files that do or do not meet Indicator 13 guidelines. It also allows for the tracking of corrections made to files which are out of compliance, identifies systemic problems and issues. It allows for the identification of the strategies and action steps IEP teams have taken for improvement. It also disaggregates data and allows for the tracking of data over time. There were a total of 75 districts that entered data into the Cutting Edj database. Of those 75 districts, 13 districts achieved 100% in the files reviewed. There were an additional four districts that achieved 80–100% and an additional four that achieved 50–79%. A total of 1558 student files were analyzed and submitted to the database from the 75 participating schools. Forty-one percent of these files were reported to meet the Indicator 13 requirements. The area most often not meeting requirements was that of transition services. This data informs professional development activities and will result in additional trainings during the 2011–12 school year.

Training/Professional Development/Technical Assistance

RPDC Consultants

The Department contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri to provide training and technical assistance to districts through the support of the following Consultant positions:

- Nineteen (19) Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans
- Twenty-four (24) SW-PBS Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Five (5) Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Three (3) Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Twenty (20) PLC Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.
- Fourteen (14) RPDC Consultants are Certified Data Team Trainers. See Overview under “Data Team Training” for more information.

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

Project ACCESS

Created in 1985, Project Access was one of the first state resource centers for autism in the nation. Project ACCESS at Missouri State University, funded 100% by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, provides autism resource information to public schools across Missouri

serving students with autism and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD) in the form of on-site and telephone consultations, as well as support via the internet.

In addition, Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and trains professional credentialed individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). These trainings are offered to Missouri school district staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0–21, who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. On-site child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and district staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs).

Through four MACs, Project ACCESS conducted four school consultations and 20 child-specific consultations in 2010–11. IDACs made 42 on-site school visits throughout the year. In addition, as part of the Building Effective Autism Team (BEAT) initiative which helps schools work on their ASD programs, Project ACCESS assigned BEAT coaches to each RPDC district and coaches were chosen to aid specific districts based on Project ACCESS criteria. Approximately 30 school districts were served through BEAT coaches during the 2010–11 year.

The Project ACCESS website (education.missouristate.edu/access/) had 15,231 unique page views from 1,066 users with at least 256 “active” users (those users who have logged onto the site multiple times) throughout the 2010–11 year. In addition, four webinars throughout the year were held regarding ASD. Participants in the webinars reported positive feedback including verification of receiving ideas and resources that would assist them in serving ASD students in their daily work.

Missouri Resources (MORE)
The Department, in conjunction with the NCRRC, supports the Missouri Resources (MORE) web-based system. This system provides SPP indicator-related information on multiple topics:

- Academic Achievement
- Disproportionality
- Dispute Resolution
- Dropout
- Early Childhood Outcomes
- Early Intervening Services (EIS)
- Graduation
- LRE (preschool- and school-age)
- Parent Involvement
- Post-secondary Transition
- Suspension and Expulsion
- Three-Tiered Models of Intervention (RtI)

Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-Based Practice, Online Resource and Definition. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address: more.northcentralrrc.org. During the 2010–11 school year, 22 new resources were added to MORE and 1,087 total unique visitors accessed the website. Future plans include adding a survey for MORE users to provide feedback on the usefulness of the site and information regarding potential enhancements.

Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP)
The Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP) training is a one-day (six-hour) training session for delivery to IEP teams. This training is conducted at least once annually in each region using the Standards-Based IEP training module. This module was developed collaboratively by the NCRRC, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC), staff from three Missouri RPDCs and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Project Forum. The training was vetted by the Department personnel. This Standards-Based IEP training takes the participant through the steps involved in developing a process of planning that improves the development of the IEP and helps the IEP team participants recognize the importance of connecting instructional goals to the general curriculum and grade-level standards. During the 2010–11 school year, RPDC Consultants held seven standards-based IEP trainings across the state with a total of 78 participants.

Evaluation

SPP Improvement Activity Evaluation
The Office of Special Education began work with the NCRRC in November 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Office of Special Education staff in an improvement activity evaluation model. Using this model, Office of Special Education staff has worked to review and revise all existing improvement activities, align the activities with all contractual activities and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for every activity. Work on the evaluation plans and implementation measures is continuing during the 2011–12 school year. The Office of Special Education is continuing to collaborate with the NCRRC in this work. In October 2011, NCRRC staff provided both Part B and Part C staff with additional training and technical assistance on SPP and APR development and SPP improvement activity selection and evaluation. Detailed action plans and evaluation measures may be found at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html.

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009–10	74.5% graduation rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Per instructions for the APR in the Measurement Table, 2009–10 data is reported for this 2010–11 APR. The data match the graduation rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Missouri Graduation Rate Trend Data			
Year	Number of Graduates with IEPs	Number of Cohort Dropouts	**Graduation Rate**
2007–08	6,874	1,718	80.0%
2008–09	7,052	1,851	79.2%
2009–10	7,093	1,795	**79.8%**

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

For 2009–10, Missouri was not yet able to calculate the graduation rate as established under the ESEA for any groups of students. The state will begin using the ESEA graduation rate calculation for the 2010–11 graduates. This calculation will be reported with the FFY11 APR submitted in February 2013.

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

The State of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri's public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those guidelines include the following provisions:

- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.
- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:

    1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
    2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
    3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.

- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

Missouri, with a graduation rate of 79.8% reported for ESEA purposes, met the established target for 2009–10 of 74.5%. As graduation rates are closely tied to dropout rates, for explanation of progress in graduation rates see description of progress for dropout rates in Indicator 2.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) in order to establish a collaborative interagency group which will develop and oversee the implementation of a coordinated state-wide plan for post secondary transition programs and services.
- Manage/support a Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field, and interact with other educators throughout the state.
- Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option Program.
- Recruit and support transition liaisons in all RPDC regions to increase state capacity to provide training and information in the area of post secondary transition.
- Recruit and support Community Transition Teams (CTTs) in all RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of best practices.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.

- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on post secondary transition.
- Support scale-up of the Transition-to-College Program to assist students with disabilities in accessing and succeeding in post-secondary education.
- Support scale-up of National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) program to additional districts in the state.

Discussion of Improvement Activities

Manage and Support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT): The Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) was formed in 2007 in order to increase interagency collaboration at the state, regional and local levels. The MITT and its task forces meet quarterly to address data-driven goals for improvement and collaboration with the shared vision of improving outcomes for Missouri students (e.g., employment, independent living and postsecondary education). The MITT consists of membership from a variety of state agencies concerned with postsecondary transition and provides a venue and mechanism to share information, network, and partner to coordinate professional development and activities.

At this time, membership roles include the following agencies: The Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT), Missouri Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE), Missouri University of Science and Technology (MST), Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation Services, Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs), Extended Employment/Sheltered Workshops, Workforce Development, Office of Special Education, Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC), Missouri Department of Mental Health (DMH), Governor's Council on Disabilities as well as local-level transition coordinators and leadership. In 2009-2010, the MITT spearheaded an interdepartmental effort to decrease the dropout rate for both students with and without disabilities in Missouri. In collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), the MITT has increased its understanding of strategies and mechanisms to decrease dropout rates, including school teaming, data-based decision making about attendance and discipline, and school culture. Members of the MITT have attended trainings in Dropout Prevention, as well as discussed coordinating professional development efforts in this area.

The MITT also supports the work of transition by collaborating to provide shared transition trainings, providing individual agency direct training to local community transition teams and attending and presenting critical transition information as a part of other statewide transition trainings.

Manage/Support a Community of Practice (CoP): The Missouri Transition Community of Practice (MO CoP) at missouritransition.org is a website designed to increase collaboration and information-sharing among transition professionals and Consultants across Missouri. This website includes information on upcoming events, resources, links to other websites, discussion forums and hosts events such as "Ask the Expert." Currently, 728 Missouri transition professionals are members of the Community of Practice. Professionals can create a free account on this website to access information and discussions. The main features of the Missouri Transition Community of Practice include:

- **Calendar:** Transition trainings and events occurring throughout the state are posted on the calendar.

- **News:** Announcements regarding training, Ask the Expert events, and Summer Institute as well as other events are shared through the news section of MO CoP. Each person enrolled in the MO CoP automatically receives an email message of any news item that is posted. This year, 20 news items were posted to the site.

- **Discussion Forums:** Fourteen unmoderated discussion forums are listed on the MO CoP covering topics such as employment, independent living, compliance, assessment, etc. Any participant using the website can post questions, comments or replies on any of the forums.

- **Ask the Expert:** events consist of information and discussion facilitated by an identified expert on a particular topic over a specified period of time. Participants can post questions or comments and view the questions and responses of others participating in the discussion. The three *Ask the Expert* event topics for the 2010–11school years were identified to correspond with the year's training priorities of employment. The *Ask the Expert* events were:

  Project SEARCH: Erin Riehle, Director, Project SEARCH, Division of Disability Services, and Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center – Nov. 1-12, 2010. During the event, *46* individuals viewed the forum discussion page. There were four threads posted with nine responses. Of the ten who responded to the effectiveness survey, 100% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, that the event was very effective, and they felt the information was helpful and addressed important issues. A total of 66.6% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

  Student-Run Enterprises: Kathi Mills, Special Education Teacher, Cass-Midway School District, and Sheila Forsyth, Transition Coordinator, Branson School District - Jan.17-28, 2011. During the event, 180 people logged on to the site. There were 17 threads with a total of 70 posts. Of the 19 individuals who completed the effectiveness survey,92.3% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, 100% agreed that the event was very effective, and 100% felt the information was helpful, 92% felt it addressed important issues. A total of 76.9% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

  Funding for School-Based and *Work-Based Career Development*: Tim McEvoy, PASS Specialist, Social Security Administration and Jennifer Kemp, Youth Policy Team Leader, U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy. There were 17 threads posted to the sight with 33 responses. Of the individuals who completed the effectiveness survey, 100% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, agreed that the event was very effective, and felt the information was helpful and addressed important issues. A total of 100% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

Recruit Districts within RPDC Region to Participate in the Missouri Option Program: The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who could complete Missouri high school graduation requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. Currently there are 186 schools participating in the Missouri Option program. This represents 32% of all Missouri Districts. In the 2010 school year, there were 83 IEP students (or 1.2%) who graduated as a part of Missouri Option. The Office of Quality Schools and the Office of Special Education have collaborated to create a marketing plan to send to Missouri schools which details the Missouri Option Program.

Recruit and Support Transition Liaisons: The Missouri Transition Liaison Program began in 2007 in order to improve transition education and services in the State of Missouri by supporting local-level leaders in transition education and services. In 2010–11, there were 22 Missouri Transition Liaisons, including ten original members. In summer 2010, five new Missouri Transition Liaisons were selected based on a competitive application process.

In 2010–11 Missouri Transition Liaisons attended three one-day professional development sessions in Jefferson City and Columbia, Missouri. Liaisons increased their knowledge about transition activities for students within their local and surrounding districts through formal presentations, collaboration and exchanging ideas and resources. In addition to receiving professional development and technical assistance, Missouri Transition Liaisons partnered with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to assist with activities at the Missouri Summer Institute in Transition. They also reviewed materials and resources prior to state-wide dissemination. Furthermore, the liaisons developed and released an electronic newsletter *Missouri Transition T.I.M.E.S-Transition Ideas with Maximum*

Effectiveness for Students (Available at missouritransition.com). The newsletter has been disseminated to school personnel, students and families.

Missouri Transition Liaisons disseminated information about transition at the local level. Dissemination methods included email correspondence, face-to-face trainings, meetings, website postings and newsletters with information, resources and tools related to transition. Additional methods included articles in local newspapers, school bulletin boards, flyers sent home to parents, hand-delivered resources to school personnel and informal conversations with staff.

Recruit and Support Community Transition Teams (CTT): From 2008 to 2011, the Department and the Transition Coalition partnered to develop 26 CTTs across Missouri. The goals of the CTTs are to:

1. Provide an understanding of transition planning, services and research-based effective practices in transition as a framework for educators, students, families, administrators, interagency personnel, community partners, and employers, to ensure that they have the necessary knowledge and tools to improve postsecondary outcomes;
2. Provide training in developing a strategic plan for community-wide transition systems;
3. Improve access to employment opportunities and other post-school activities as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and
4. Elevate community awareness of, and commitment to, improving student outcomes.

In March 2011, 26 CTTs from three cohorts completed the Community Transition Team Outreach Assessment, providing quantitative data and listing activities and products developed by the team. The CTTs reported that their team activities focused primarily on students and parents/caregivers. Examples of some tools and resources developed by the CTTs impacting their local community were:

- Local or regional transition Fairs, often in partnership with the RPDCs;
- Resource Directories and brochures;
- School Board presentations, newspaper releases, presentations at school or community meetings, and networking at social events to increase awareness of CTT activities and purpose;
- Informational meetings for students and parents;
- School and community newsletters;
- New transition programs within the school setting;
- Professional development trainings within the district or in partnership with RPDCs and agency representatives;
- CTT information on the district website or the city/community website;
- Public service announcements on the local radio station; and
- Daily school bulletin posts on transition-related initiatives.

In the summer of 2010, ten teams were selected through a competitive process to participate in the Cohort III Missouri CTT Training. School personnel submitted the application and recruited additional members to create a six-person core team to attend three two-day training sessions (Fall-Winter-Spring) in Jefferson City. Membership included school personnel, Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, parents, DMH case managers, RPDC Consultants, Missouri Protection and Advocacy (P & A) representatives, employers and a variety of adult service providers from their communities. Team membership was individualized based on the services available and needs within their community. The ten Cohort III (2010-2013) CTTs received ongoing professional development focused on self-assessment and analysis of local needs, membership analysis, team names, goals and vision statements. Action plans and goals were developed and updated on an ongoing basis during each session. Over the three training sessions, 12 guest speakers from a variety of Missouri adult service agencies provided an overview of their programs and information specific to the mission of their organizations.

There were also two one-day trainings provided to the eight teams in Cohort II (2009-2012) CTTs. The teams met in the fall and spring to learn content, collaborate with other teams, and review and revise action plans. Teams developed a sustainability strategic plan to recruit new members to their group and worked to achieve their established goals.

Eight Cohort I (2008-2011) CTT leaders participated in a teleconference to provide a summary of their current practices, reconnect with other cohort teams, and request technical assistance or support from the Transition Coalition. The format was a structured forum and participants were provided a series of questions prior to the call for reflection and report out during the session on the sustainability of the teams.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Performance data by district and region is provided annually to the RPDC Consultants to enable them to identify and provide technical assistance and professional development to districts in order to improve performance in areas of need. Using the data, Consultants target districts for technical assistance. Consultant logs indicate a total of 568 visits to 253 districts identified by the RPDCs as needing targeted technical assistance on this indicator.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See the APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Post Secondary Transition: Models of Success are local-level transition practices that have been proven to be effective in Missouri schools. According to Google Analytics, during the period of time from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, the main page of Models of Success was viewed 2,308 times by 1,420 individual users. This data includes anyone who visited this page during the year, not just Missouri residents. The following method was utilized for the identification of Models of Success:

Solicitation
Submission forms were disseminated at face-to-face conferences, meetings, etc. by Transition Coalition, RPDC, and Department staff. Submission forms were posted on the Missouri Transition Community of Practice (CoP) and emails with information and the application were sent on SELS and the CoP. The online submission form was available on transitioncoalition.org.

Review
Transition Coalition staff reviewed the submissions using a rubric. They followed up with the applicants to develop detailed descriptions. A summary of each submission and the results of the review process, as well as the programs/practices that were recommended for development online, were provided to the Department for final approval.

Development
Transition Coalition staff worked with the identified Models of Success to finalize descriptions and materials for posting to Models of Success page of transitioncoalition.org. Transition Coalition staff followed up with contacts for each model annually to update their information and to ensure the model was still in place.

Dissemination
Models identified were highlighted at appropriate face-to-face trainings, conferences and online events in Missouri. RPDC Consultants and Transition Liaisons were informed of the models so that they may use them as examples in appropriate training sessions they provide. A link to the Models of Success page was provided on the MO CoP at missouritransition.org.

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Post Secondary Transition: Through a collaborative effort between the Department and the KU Transition Coalition, three online independent-study training modules have been developed for transition professionals in Missouri. They include case studies, performance-based assessments, and resources on

transition compliance, best practices, and transition assessment, and they are available at no cost on the Transition Coalition website. *The Best Practices in Transition Planning* module was released in spring 2008, *Transition Assessment: The Big Picture* module in spring 2009, *Student Engagement and Self-determination* module in the spring of 2010 and *Employment Outcomes* in the spring of 2011.

RPDC Consultants provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance to teachers and school teams within each region of Missouri. All school districts have access to a RPDC Consultant specializing in transition.

Over the past four years, five transition workshop packages have been developed for RPDC Consultants. Incorporating a train-the-trainer model, Consultants provided input into the training topic and materials, observed the training being conducted, discussed adaptations to the training, and then provided the training within their regions. The Consultants provided 107 trainings on these packages during the 2010–11 school years with a total of 1146 participants. The Consultants also have access to an online community of practice for in-depth discussions and to share resources.

Transition-to-College Program: In 2009, the College of Education at Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) and Southeast Regional Professional Development Center (SERPDC) collaborated to offer students with disabilities who plan to attend either the SEMO campus or a regional campus to have the opportunity to experience what college is like prior to the beginning of classes. The focus is on making a successful transition from high school to college via a two-day/one-night experience that incorporates becoming acquainted with various on-campus services: the Learning Assistance Programs and Disability Support Services office, the campus shuttle, the university counseling center and others. Those students participating in the program also meet with a panel of students with disabilities who share experiences about campus life. The Office of Special Education offered training on this program to the RPDC transition Consultants in 2010, and budgeted for this to be replicated at the other RPDCs across the state.

National Dropout-Prevention Center — Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD): In 2008–09, through an extensive needs assessment and data analysis, the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) identified the common statewide need for Dropout Prevention of students both with and without disabilities. An interdepartmental effort began in 2009 to address the problem of dropout in Missouri. In the fall of 2009, Missouri signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a partnership with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD). NDPC-SD was established in January 2004 to support states in assisting local education agencies (LEAs) to increase school completion rates and decrease dropout rates among students with disabilities. NDPC-SD is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and is part of OSEP's Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network designed to support the national implementation of provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

The NDPC-SD provides training and technical assistance to decrease dropout rates in Missouri schools. Efforts are directed at the school-level rather than district-level. The selection process identified schools already selected by the Office of College and Career Readiness to participate in a Statewide Dropout Summit. A total of 42 high schools and their feeder middle schools were invited to apply to become part of the project intended to impact all students, both with and without disabilities. Eight schools were chosen from three geographic areas around the state, one urban, one rural and one consortium of six high schools in Southwest Missouri.

In the fall of 2009, Missouri took a group representing four of the pilot schools to attend the dropout summit in Baltimore, MD. In 2010–2011, teams from all eight schools received six days of intensive training consisting of drilling down data and identifying areas of need, as well as assistance in identifying evidence-based interventions to impact the overall number of students dropping out.

During the past year, the Department has developed an online database for pilot schools to upload data on a regular basis. This data includes discipline referrals, academic achievement, attendance, and other information critical to identifying school-wide areas for improvement. Also, the Department collected action plans from the pilot schools in order to track progress and plan technical assistance and support.

Staff from the pilot schools presented at the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center Conference and at the 2011 DESE Transition Institute. Initial data show that these schools are increasing graduation rates and reducing dropout rates for students with disabilities. All schools will also continue to receive follow-up technical assistance and professional development from the NDPC-SD during the 2011–12 school year. In addition, in August 2011, Missouri applied for and received an intensive technical assistance grant from the NDPC-SD which will be used both for support of existing model schools and to add an additional cohort of model schools during the 2011–12 school year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. However, two additional improvement activities regarding Check and Connect have been added to the SPP.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009–10	4.9% dropout rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Per instructions for the APR, 2009–10 data is reported for this 2010–11 APR. The data match the dropout rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Year	Number of Dropouts with IEPs in Grades 9-12	Number of IEP Students in Grades 9-12	**Dropout Rate**
2007–08	1,874	38,016	4.9%
2008–09	1,861	37,292	5.0%
2009–10	1,518	36,326	**4.2%**

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

A dropout is an individual who:

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

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

With a 4.2% dropout rate, the state met the 2009–10 target of 4.9% and saw a significant decrease in the dropout rate from the previous year of 5.0%. An analysis of data and evaluation of improvement activities

related to dropouts yielded the following: Technical assistance from the NDPC-SD to a cohort of eight school districts resulted in a 9.8% decrease in the number of dropouts within the participating schools. Three of the participating schools are among some of the larger schools in the state and demonstrated a significant decline in their number of dropouts from 2009-10 to 2010-11. A further analysis of statewide dropout data shows that 27 additional school districts demonstrated significant declines in their dropout rate. Of those districts, ten were large school districts including the two of the largest in the state.

See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. However, two additional improvement activities regarding Check and Connect have been added to the SPP.

See Indicator 1 for Improvement Activities.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	A. Percent of districts meeting AYP: 37% B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA -- 95% Math – 95% C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 75.5% Math – 72.5%

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

At 99.3% for communication arts (CA) and 99.2% mathematics (Math), the state met the 2010–11 target of 95% for indicator 3B (participation). At 17.5%, the state did not meet the target for 3A (AYP) of 37%. At 27% for CA and 29.6% for Math, the state did not meet the targets for 3C (proficiency) of 75.5% for CA and 72.5% for Math. The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8. Prior to the 2008–09 school year, at the high school level, CA was assessed at grade 11 and Math was assessed at grade 10.

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

Public reports of assessment data are available online at http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx and dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/Assessment.pdf.
CHECK THESE LINKS BEFORE SENDING TO OSEP!

A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

The AYP proficiency goals for 2010–11 were 75.5% for communication arts and 72.5% for mathematics.

Districts Meeting State Minimum for AYP Targets in Disability Subgroup				
Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	**Percent Met for IEP Subgroup**
2006-07	Communication Arts	32	233	13.7%
	Mathematics	69	230	30.0%
	Combined – CA & Math	25	235	10.6%
2007–08	Communication Arts	72	319	22.6%
	Mathematics	103	324	31.8%
	Combined – CA & Math	60	327	18.3%
2008–09	Communication Arts	121	331	36.6%
	Mathematics	114	327	34.9%
	Combined – CA & Math	84	334	25.1%
2009–10	Communication Arts	93	326	28.5%
	Mathematics	112	317	35.3%
	Combined – CA & Math	70	328	21.3%
2010–11	Communication Arts	82	308	26.6%
	Mathematics	89	309	28.8%
	Combined – CA & Math	55	315	**17.5%**

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

B. Participation Rate for Children with IEPs

MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities				
	Total Students with Disabilities	Regular MAP Assessment Participation	MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation	**Participation Rate**
2006-07 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%
2006-07 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%
2007-08 Communication Arts	66,425	61,469	4,717	99.6%
2007-08 Mathematics	67,754	62,636	4,826	99.6%
2008-09 Communication Arts	67,124	61,629	5,264	99.7%
2008-09 Mathematics	66,179	60,680	5,251	99.6%
2009-10 Communication Arts	64,827	58,882	5,761	99.7%
2009-10 Mathematics	64,565	58,534	5,801	99.6%
2010-11 Communication Arts	63,013	56,614	5,967	**99.3%**
2010-11 Mathematics	63,369	56,843	6,006	**99.2%**

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

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

"Proficiency" includes the top two of four achievement levels, proficient and advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities (includes only students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year)			
	Total	Proficient or Advanced	**Proficiency Rate**
2008–09 Communication Arts Total	66,902	15,789	23.6%
2008–09 Mathematics Total	65,605	16,926	25.8%
2009–10 Communication Arts Total	64,664	16,942	26.2%
2009–10 Mathematics Total	64,319	18,781	29.2%
2010–11 Communication Arts Total	62,685	16,925	**27.0%**
2010–11 Mathematics Total	63,010	18,651	**29.6%**

Source: State Assessment (AYP) data

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Indicator 3A decreased in 2011, due to the substantial annual increases in the proficiency targets.

The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities.

The state did not meet the proficiency targets established for Indicator 3C for 2010–11 which are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students. While the targets were not met, the state did see some progress in the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or advanced.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts.
- Develop and pilot an integrated three-tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective three-tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students.
- Provide information to various stakeholders on Response to Intervention (RtI).
- Provide training/professional development to districts through the RPDC Consultants on Response to Intervention (RtI).
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Support, through Project ACCESS, the development of services and programs to increase school district capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities.

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech Project: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech (Tts)."

Develop and Pilot an Integrated Three-Tiered Support System: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Response to Intervention (RtI)."

Provide Information to Various Stakeholders on Response to Intervention (RtI): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Response to Intervention (RtI)."

Provide Training/Professional Development to Districts through the RPDC Consultants on Response to Intervention (RtI): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Response to Intervention (RtI)."

Support the Implementation of a Statewide System of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Support, through Project ACCESS, the Development of Services and Programs to Increase School District Capacity to Serve Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Project ACCESS."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Accommodations and Modifications to Improve the Achievement of Students with Disabilities: Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and modifications are accomplished through the work of the regional Special Education Consultants described in the overview category labeled Consultants.

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

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Improvement Plans: The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, address it through an objective and strategies.

In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan. See the APR Overview for more information on the activities implemented by grant recipients under the category labeled “Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants” for more information.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	A. 0.5% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates B. 0% of districts have significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in suspension/expulsion rates; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the discrepancies that are not in compliance

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Per OSEP's instructions for the APR, 2009–10 data for 4A and 4B are being utilized

For Indicator 4A, with 0% districts identified with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of 0.5% of districts identified based on data from 2009–10.

For indicator 4B, this APR includes the number of districts identified as having significant discrepancies. Results of reviews will be reported in the clarification week update, and the correction of any identified noncompliance will be reported in the FFY12 APR due February 1, 2013.

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

The Department uses Method B.

With this APR, Missouri has changed the minimum cell size from five to ten. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

INDICATOR 4A

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

The cut point used for Indicator 4A is 4.0.

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

4A: Discipline Summary Based on 2009-10 Data	
Total LEAs in state	561
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	58
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count (of the 493 excluded, 301 reported no long-term out-of-school removals)	493
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	8
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates	7
Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)**	0
Percent of districts with significant discrepancies	**0.0%**

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file (Table 5 of Information Collection 1820–1621)

INDICATOR 4B

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents for students with disabilities in a racial/ethnic group, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities in the racial/ethnic group (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students of all racial/ethnic groups (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

The cut point used for Indicator 4B for each racial/ethnic group is 4.0.

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

4B: Discipline Summary Based on 2009–10 Data			
	Black	**White**	**Asian, Native American, Hispanic**
Total number of districts	561	561	561
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	30	37	0
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count	531 (of which 500 had no reported incidents)	524 (of which 360 had no reported incidents)	561 (of which 522 had no reported incidents)
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	12	5	0
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates	12	4	0
(a) Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)**	10	0	0
(b) Districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	To be reported in clarification response	0	0
(b) as a percent of districts		**0.0%**	**0.0%**

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file

Unduplicated districts excluded from calculations: based on the table above a total of 53 districts met the minimum “n” size for one or more racial/ethnic categories. This resulted in 508 (561 – 53) unduplicated districts excluded from calculations.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

For the 2009-10 school year (based on 2008-09 and 2009-10 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension expulsion rates for Indicator 4A, but ten districts were identified for Indicator 4B. This resulted in the state meeting the Indicator 4A target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The state will report on results of reviews for Indicator 4B in the clarification week response.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: Since no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, no districts were reviewed, and no noncompliance was identified for this indicator. If districts had been identified, the review process would have included three basic components that address the requirement to review and, if appropriate require affected LEAs to revise their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior support and procedural safeguards:

1. Monitoring staff review district policies and procedures related to discipline.

2. Monitoring staff conduct file reviews of students who had been long-term suspended or expelled to determine if districts are in compliance with respect to the discipline related requirements of IDEA. The indicators reviewed include such topics as provision of the procedural safeguard notice, as appropriate; conducting manifestation determination meetings; development of IEPs that document provision of services to students who are

long term suspended or expelled; review/development of Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Behavior Assessments; consideration of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the IEP.

3. Monitoring staff conduct interviews of regular and special education staff to assess their level of understanding of procedures and practices in place within district buildings related to discipline of students with and without disabilities. For example, the file reviews demonstrate documentation in the IEP, but interviews shed more light on IEP implementation practices.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.

2010–11 Improvement Activity Discussion

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

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

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants."

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Support the Implementation of a Statewide System of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)."

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Improvement Plans: Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. If discipline is identified as an area in need of improvement, the districts

must address it through objectives and strategies. Depending upon the results of the Department's review, districts identified with significant discrepancies in the area of suspension/expulsion may also be required to develop an improvement plan. In both cases, RPDC Consultants provide the districts with training and professional development to complete and implement an effective improvement plan.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. However, two additional improvement activities regarding Check and Connect have been added to the SPP.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day: 59.5% B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 10.2% C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.5%

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

At 9.3%, the state met the target of 10.2% for Indicator 5B. At 58.6% and 3.6%, the targets of 59.5% and 3.5% for Indicators 5A and 5C respectively were not met; however, improvement was shown in all areas.

Special Education Placement Data for ages 6–21						
	2008–09		2009–10		2010–11	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A)	68,222	58.0%	66,653	58.4%	**65,248**	**58.6%**
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	30,335	25.8%	29,290	25.7%	28,601	25.7%
Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B)	11,522	9.8%	10,948	9.6%	**10,384**	**9.3%**
Separate School	3,779	3.2%	3,481	3.0%	3,258	2.9%
Homebound/Hospital	690	0.6%	696	0.6%	715	0.6%
Residential Facility	1	0.0%	4	0.0%	4	0.0%
Total Separate (5C)	4,470	3.8%	4,181	3.7%	**3,977**	**3.6%**
Correctional Facilities	1,072	0.9%	952	0.8%	917	0.8%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,080	1.8%	2,142	1.9%	2,146	1.9%
Total School Age	117,701	100.0%	114,166	100.0%	111,273	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements via MOSIS Student Core. The count date for each year is December 1 and are the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

With 58.6%, the state did not meet the target of 59.5% for Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A). At 3.6%, the state did not meet the target of 3.5% for Separate Settings (5C). With 9.3%, the state met the target of 9.6% for Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B). While the targets for 5A and 5C were not met, the data indicates progress from the previous years in both categories. Analysis of statewide data shows that, with few exceptions, most districts have shown steady percentages in all placement areas for the past five years. As the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires LEAs to maintain a continuum of placement options and placement is an Individual Education Program (IEP) team decision, it is difficult to determine the percentages that are ultimately appropriate for each placement category. As described below, the state continues to emphasize placement in the LRE through technical assistance and professional development activities.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for differentiated instruction, three-tiered models and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Improvement Activity Discussion

Support the Use of Three-Tiered Intervention Models and Inclusive Instructional Practices
The Office of Special Education has numerous activities which focus on support for districts to use three-tiered models of Prevention/Intervention. Those activities are:

- *Improvement Grants***:** The Office of Special Education awards $2,000,000 in Improvement Grants to districts annually. Criteria for obtaining a special education improvement grant include an emphasis on the use of tiered-models of intervention and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching and differentiated instruction). See Overview under the category labeled Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants.
- *Demonstration Sites***:** See APR overview under the categories labeled Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network and Response to Intervention.
- *State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)***:** The SPDG, awarded in 2007, is a project to develop and implement an integrated model of tiered student support. The project at the present time is in a pilot phase, but plans are to scale up statewide in the future. See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.
- e*Mints***:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS).

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies: The Office of Special Education has developed training modules for use by the RPDC Consultants in the areas of differentiated instruction and co-teaching**.** The co-teaching materials were developed by Dr. Marilyn Friend. A DVD on co-teaching has also been produced and

provided to the RPDCs to use in the trainings. Regional Consultants provide at least one co-teaching and one differentiated instruction training annually in each RPDC region across the state. In addition, the Office of Special Education has provided the RPDC Consultants with materials and training on three-tiered models of intervention. See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention. During the 2010–11 school year, RPDC Consultants held 10 co-teaching trainings and 14 differentiated instruction trainings across the state; there were 311 and 210 participants in co-teaching training and differentiated instruction training respectively.

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs: See Overview under category labeled "Standards-based IEPs."

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance to Districts Identified as Not Meeting or in Danger of Not Meeting State Targets: The Office of Special Education makes data on educational environments by district and region available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on an annual basis. These data are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions that are in danger of not meeting the targets for each of the sub indicators, indicating needed training and/or technical assistance. Once districts are identified regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies. For the 2010–11 school year, 17 school districts were required to address LRE in their improvement plan. Since 2007–08, the number of districts required to address LRE in improvement plans has steadily decreased from 65 to 17, suggesting overall improvement in LRE percentages.

RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the Department-supported Co-Teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend, continues to be disseminated by the RPDC Consultants. Office of Special Education staff is working with e-Learning for Educators to make LRE training modules accessible via the web.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under categories labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)" and "RPDC Consultants." The Office of Special Education has collaborated with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two-part RtI overview available online and in DVD format and provided an opportunity for "ask the expert" questions from the field. The overview is available at dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars_presentations.html. Regular reminders of the availability of this training are sent to the field via the special education SELS listserv.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Measurement:

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	Not applicable due to data collection changes.

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Per OSEP instructions, due to federal data collection changes, states need not report on this indicator for the 2010–11school year. New baseline data and targets will need to be established in the future.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

Not applicable.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008–09 reporting):

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress

category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets		
		Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2
2010–11	A: Social Emotional	92.7%	55.6%
	B: Knowledge and Skills	93.8%	42.4%
	C: Behaviors	90.7%	60.7%

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

2010–11 Early Childhood Outcomes Data						
	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	54	1.15%	81	1.73%	66	1.41%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable	165	3.52%	104	2.22%	181	3.86%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	2058	43.90%	2577	54.97%	1790	38.18%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable	1351	28.82%	1423	30.35%	1503	32.06%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable	1060	22.61%	503	10.73%	1148	24.49%
Total	4688	1%	4688	1%	4688	1%

2010–11 Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Statements			
	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs
	% of children	% of children	% of children
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	94.0%	95.6%	93.0%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited.	51.4%	41.1%	56.5%

Definition of "Comparable to Same-Aged Peers"
Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1–5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-

appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

At 94.0%, 95.6% and 93.0%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statement one for outcomes A (92.7%), B (93.8%) and C (90.7%). At 51.4%, 41.1% and 56.5%, Missouri did not meet any of the three targets for summary statement two for outcomes A (55.6%), B (42.4%) and C (60.7%).

In reviewing data for the Missouri Part C Indicator 3, Missouri Part C also met the targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas and did not meet the targets for Summary Statement 2 for any of the three outcome areas. Missouri Part C has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age delay and does not serve at risk children. The results for this indicator are demonstrative of the State's eligibility criteria since the children who are entering the First Steps program show increased growth, yet they are not exiting at age expectations.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children (66%) continue to be eligible and receive services in Part B, Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). As demonstrated in the data above, children receiving services in Part B (ECSE) continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes; however, due to the severity of disabilities of children transitioning from Part C, they are not exiting Part B performing at age expectations.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) training through periodic face-to-face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes.
- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data.

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide ECO Training: All ECO training materials, including a video presentation, handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html. ECSE program and System Point of Entry (SPOE) Administrators receive regular reminders through Listservs regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training for staff who will be administering the assessment and the timely and accurate reporting of the data. Plans are in place to move this training to an eLearning environment so it is more accessible and participation can be tracked.

Evaluate First Steps and ECO Data through MOSIS annually: Cross checks were performed to analyze whether improvements were made in agencies using First Steps (Part C) exit ratings for ECSE entry ratings. The number of children for whom the First Steps exit ratings were used for ECSE entry ratings has increased more than 80% since 2008–09. School districts that reported child count numbers for the December 1st cycle but had not reported entry/exit ratings for those children were contacted to ensure the entry of necessary/correct data. Districts were also contacted for other data anomalies.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. ECO data were first publicly reported for the 2009–10 school year and is shared annually with the RPDC personnel in order to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.

DESE Response
The state has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with this APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	80.0% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

At 71.4% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, Missouri did not meet the target of 80% established for the 2010–11 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting Missouri school districts. Since the inception of MSIP in 1990, MSIP reviews have been conducted on a five-year cycle with approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 523 districts as well as other responsible public agencies reviewed each year. These reviews included the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys were used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys were sent to all parents in the approximately 100 school districts undergoing MSIP reviews each year.

In 2010–11, the Department reevaluated the MSIP process and determined that the above-described five-year cycle would no longer be utilized. As a result, the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) will no longer be available to the Office of Special Education for data collection purposes on Indicator 8. The Office of Special Education is investigating other means by which to collect the data for this indicator.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

State-Level Stratified Sampling Scheme		
FRL	Minority	Majority
Less Than 33%	cell 1	cell 2
33% to 54%	cell 3	cell 4
55% or More	cell 5	cell 6

In previous years, a sample of special education parents was drawn using the above sampling scheme. The results from the sample were slightly less than the results from all respondents; however the differences in the percents in agreement were not significant, thereby establishing the reliability of the data. The validity of the data is ensured through use of the MSIP Parent AQ, which has been determined by OSEDA to be a valid instrument for gathering data from parents.

Results of Parent Survey

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2010–11 Parents of Students with Disabilities	5,664 **(71.4%)**	2,270 (28.6%)	7,934 (100.0%)
2009–10 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,565 (69.3%)	2,027 (30.7%)	6,592 (100.0%)
2008–09 Parents of Students with Disabilities	5,103 (69.6%)	2,234 (30.4%)	7,337 (100.0%)
2007–08 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006–07 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

With an agreement rate of 71.4%, the state did not meet the target of 80.0% established for the 2010–11 school year. Due to the process of using MSIP AQ data for this indicator, each year is comprised of a new set of districts making it difficult to analyze progress or slippage and any effects from the implementation of Improvement Activities. However, as can be seen from the chart above, the trend of agreement has clustered consistently around 70% with the exception of the 2007–08 data being slightly higher. As discussed above, the Department will no longer be conducting the advance questionnaires as a part of the MSIP process. The Office of Special Education is currently looking at alternative data collection measures for this indicator.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.
- Support Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers.

- Support through the MPACT a parent mentor program that provides Technical Assistant (TA) and support to parents of students with disabilities.
- Support, through Project ACCESS and MPACT, the provision of materials, information, training, and resource referrals for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).
- Support professional development for Parents as Teachers (PAT) parent educators to increase their knowledge and ability to inform and assist families of children with disabilities to link with needed resources.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in parental involvement to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Develop and provide a Parent and Family Involvement training module to facilitate improved involvement of parents/families of students with disabilities in their children’s education.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Develop an Improved Data Collection Process to Measure Parent Involvement: The Office of Special Education identified five questions from the NCSEAM parent survey to be included on the 2010–11 Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ). Staff is also currently working with the Office of Quality Schools at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis at the University of Missouri to develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.

Support MPACT to Provide Training, Resources and Materials: The Department supports the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent and family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers. Information was provided through the MPACT newsletter in the following areas: IEP process, other IDEA processes, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and Section 504 of the ADA. The MPACT e-newsletter was sent bi-monthly via listserv and posted on the MPACT website. Online database resources were frequently updated to fulfill the Department's reporting requirements. There were 120 updates made to the MPACT website during the year including the archiving of the e-newsletter, mentor monthly trainings and state resource listings. The website received 6,088 page views during the year; 1361 of which were unique web hits. Parent materials providing information on special education process, IDEA updates, effective practices, state-wide assessment and research-based intervention were provided to the public using various means of distribution. The RtI and three-tiered model portion of the website received 105 views. In addition, 41 individuals participated in a RtI three-tiered model of intervention workshop.

Support a Parent Mentor Program: To facilitate parent involvement in the LEA and to provide peer support to parents in the special education process, the Department funds MPACT to support a parent mentor program. This program provides technical assistance and support to parents of students with disabilities. MPACT employs six Regional Coordinators and one Mentor Coordinator to provide support for 48 Parent Mentors. MPACT recruits and trains Mentors, assists with the certification process, and provides assignments and technical assistance to Mentors. This assistance includes coordination and support through monthly trainings and quarterly Mentor meetings. MPACT also provides training in data collection for mentors. Online access to monthly trainings, reporting, surveys and technical support is available via a secure site on MPACT's website. In the 2010–11 school year, professional development was delivered to Mentors who give peer support to parents in the IEP process. MPACT staff also provided modeling of the IEP process for Parent Mentors and evaluated the performance of Mentors during the IEP process. Information was provided to parents and professionals about three-tiered interventions and progress monitoring via an online training.

Support Collaboration with ACCESS: MPACT and Project ACCESS collaborated to create materials, information, training and resources for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). A training dealing with writing post secondary goals for students with ASD to assist with transition was completed in the summer of 2010. Dissemination of information and training was conducted during the 2010–11 school year. There were 75 parents, students and educators who attended training for "Writing Post Secondary Goals for Students with ASD." This training addressed the development of post secondary goals dealing with common concerns among students with ASD: communication, social skills, self regulation and sensory concerns — as well as transition assessment and measuring progress. Post-test training showed increases of understanding in the following areas:"Prior to turning 18, parents must give consent for the student to be invited to the IEP meeting" — 15.1% increase; Post secondary transition planning goals MUST be in place upon the student's 16th birthday — 12.1% increase; "Vocational options for post secondary transition Planning are the responsibility of VR" — 11.6% increase; "A student with classic autism would tend to have more issues with anxiety and mental health concerns than a student with Asperger Syndrome" — 8.9% increase; "Students with autism tend to outgrow sensory concerns as they mature" — 2.4% increase.

Support Professional Development for Parents as Teachers (PAT): There were 50 scholarships awarded to parent educators across the state selected by the Parents as Teachers National Center (PATNC). Parent educators eligible for these scholarship awards must have successfully completed PATNC's initial Born to Learn Institute and be working in a Missouri Parents as Teachers (PAT) program. Announcement letters were mailed to all district PAT Coordinators inviting them or a parent educator they supervise to apply for a scholarship to the special needs training. The deadline for submission was September 10, 2010. There were 94 applications submitted from 88 districts. Awards were chosen by the date of return and whether the applicant had attended in the past.

PATNC surveyed those individuals receiving the training. Of the 31 respondents, 99% of them agreed the training supported their work with children and families. The respondents also indicated the information from the training had:

- been shared with the families they serve (26 of 31 respondents),
- been shared with the coworkers (26),
- helped them to better identify delays or behaviors which might warrant intervention (29),
- helped them to know how to make referrals to the appropriate sources (29), and
- helped them use the information to promote positive intervention strategies for children (29).

In addition, all respondents indicated they had used the materials provided. The Special Needs Guide was reported to be utilized between 1–10 times (24), National Early Intervention or State Resources pages (19) and the handouts between 1–10 times (24).

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Data was provided to the Regional Professional Development Consultants through a listing of districts who did not meet targets on the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire data for Indicator 8.

Provide Evidence-Based Practices: See APR Overview under the category labeled “Missouri Resources (MORE).” The MORE website provides information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator. In the 2009–10 school year, two resources were added specifically for parents.

Recruit and Develop “Models of Success” in Parent Involvement: During 2009–10, an initial district was identified through a nomination process as having a high quality model for encouraging parent involvement by the Department. In the fall of 2010, Missouri initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in supporting parent involvement programs. This identification process included adapting a selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it was specific to Missouri. This process included a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model will work with the Department to create a description of the program. In

the 2010–11 school year, the Department created a parent webpage to showcase parent Models of Success as well as resources for parents and districts. The Department webpage provides information about the models.

The Office of Special Education has also been collecting information from the 14 pilot schools/districts that participate in the SPDG MIM project (see Overview for more information). Parent and Community Involvement is one of the 11 essential elements in this model, and all of the 14 districts report they have been developing and implementing research-based parent involvement activities as a part of their MIM activities.

Develop and Provide a Parent and Family Involvement Training Module: Based upon information obtained in the Quality Indicator Needs Assessment administered to district personnel by the Transition Coalition, a module for parent and family involvement in the transition process will be developed and disseminated in the 2011–12 school year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/563 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state's identification method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under-representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

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

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 563 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

- White: 119
- Black: 73
- Hispanic: 46
- Asian: 17
- Native American: 4
- Pacific Islander: 0
- Multi-racial: 17

Based on the information above, a total of 120 districts had the minimum "n" size for one or more racial/ethnic groups. This resulted in 443 (563 – 120) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

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

2010–11 Indicator 9 Identification Data		
Year	**Number of LEAs meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)**	**Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification**
2010-11 identification using data from 2009-10 & 2010-11	0 LEAs under and 0 LEAs over in any race/ethnicity category	0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 563 LEAs.

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

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

As indicated in the table above, in 2010–11 no LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2009–10 and 2010–11, therefore no reviews were conducted, resulting in no LEAs with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

0% of LEAs (0 / 563 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2009–10; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2008–09; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
N/A. There were no findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of LEAs having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation.
- Provide training and professional development resources to districts identified with inappropriate identification.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Training and Information on Identification and Review Process to Districts: The initial identification is based on the Special Education child count and district enrollment data. Information on the identification and review process of districts is included in various trainings regarding special education data and compliance such as New Directors of Special Education Institute held in July 2010, Special Education Administrators Conference held in September 2010, monthly webinars, and Special Education monitoring training held in October and November 2010. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are assigned a Special Education Supervisor to assist them with the monitoring process.

Provide Training and Professional Development: Training and professional development from RPDC Special Education Improvement Consultants are available to aid in developing strategies to increase instructional effectiveness for all students. A self assessment tool from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) that allows schools to conduct a self assessment of their programs and practices in five domains: (a) School Governance, Organization, Policy and Climate; (b) Family Involvement; (c) Curriculum; (d) Organization of Learning; and (e) Special Education Referral

Process and Programs available at nccrest.org/publications/tools/assessment.html. The Department has made available numerous resources to improve instructional effectiveness through the use of tiered intervention models that may be accessed at dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are encouraged to use these resources to enhance instructional effectiveness, increase student achievement and eliminate disproportionate representation through effective referral and identification procedures.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. When data suggest that disproportionate representation is or could become an issue, districts and their RPDC Consultants are notified. Technical assistance is available through the RPDCs.

Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources and Support for Identified Districts: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

MONITORING WILL BE COMPLETED BY END OF DECEMBER 2011 – NEED TO UPDATE WITH THAT DATA The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/563 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"	
Risk Ratio	**Cell size**

Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation Less than 0.25 for under representation	OR	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)	AND

Data for all LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 563 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

Disproportionate Representation Districts Examined									
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	Multi Racial	Unduplicated Districts Included	Unduplicated Districts Excluded
SLD	59	45	18	1	1	0	5	60	503
Autism	19	10	2	2	0	0	1	20	543
Sp/Lang	49	34	18	3	0	0	4	50	513
ED	21	17	1	0	0	0	1	22	541
MR	25	23	2	1	0	0	0	27	536
OHI	37	30	3	1	0	0	2	37	526

Based on the table above, 66 districts were evaluated for one or more disability and race/ethnicity combinations. This results in 497 (563–66) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for 2010–11 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation for each disability category. As stated previously, LEAs are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

2010–11 Indicator 10 Identification Data		
Year	**Number of districts meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)**	**Number of districts with Disproportional Representation as a result of inappropriate identification**
2010-11 identification using data from 2009-10 & 2010-11	• SLD: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Autism: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Sp/Lang: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • ED: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • MR: 3 LEAs with over-representation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category • OHI: 1 LEA with under-representation of Asian students; 0 over in any race/ethnicity category	• SLD: 0 • Autism: 0 • Sp/Lang: 0 • ED: 0 • MR: 0 – COMPLIANCE CONFIRM • OHI: 0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 563 LEAs. Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional

Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR) and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2010–11, four districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2009–10 and 2010–11, three in the area of over-representation of black students with MR and one in the area of under-representation of Asian students with OHI.

MONITORING WILL BE COMPLETED BY END OF DECEMBER 2011 – NEED TO UPDATE WITH THAT DATA Four of the five districts had previously had a monitoring review conducted which showed that disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification. The review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e., black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over- or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

For the fourth district which had underrepresentation of Asian students identified in the category of OHI, an analysis of statewide assessment program data showed that in this district Asian students score consistently higher than other racial/ethnic groups and are, thus, less likely to be referred for special education, therefore, it was determined that no review was required for this district.

0% of districts (0 / 563 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2009–10, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2008–09, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Measurement:

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

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of children will be evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

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

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

The State Regulations (Regulation III – Identification and Evaluation Page 32–33. dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf) include the following language regarding initial evaluation timelines:

> *Evaluation Timelines*
> *The public agency shall provide the parent with a Notice of Intent to Evaluate as soon as possible, but within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of referral for evaluation. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause (school breaks for summer or holidays, student illness, etc.) and documented in the student's record.*
>
> *The evaluation shall be completed and a decision regarding eligibility rendered within sixty (60) calendar days following parent consent or notice, as the case may be. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause and documented in the student's record.*
>
> *Initial Evaluation (34 CFR 300.301)*
> *Each public agency shall conduct a full and individual initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR 300.305 and 34 CFR 300.306, before the initial provision of special education and related services to a child with a disability. This may or may not include additional testing as determined by the evaluation team members.*

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

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

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

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

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

These data were gathered in the web-based IMACS. Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60-days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
    - Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data was completed by Compliance Supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by Compliance Supervisors and other assigned Department staff.

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

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

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

Initial Evaluation Timelines 2010–11					
Year	**Number with consent to evaluate**	**Number within 60-day timeline**	**Number > 60-days with acceptable reason**	**Number within 60-days or with acceptable reason**	**Percent within acceptable timelines**
2010–11 Total	3,435 (a)	3,013	347	3,360 (b)	**97.8%**
Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 107 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2010–11. A total of 104 of the 107 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.					

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

Three children who fell within the exceptions in 34 CFR 300.301(d) were excluded from the numerator and denominator of the calculation.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend					
Year	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.0%	97.1%	97.8%	96.8%	97.8%

The number of days past the 60-day timeline ranged from one day to 141 days, with over 80% of the delays due to acceptable reasons. Approximately 80% of the delays were 20 days or less with 51% of the delays ten days or less and 30% of the delays five days or less. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable were due to valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluations; or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks. The districts found out of compliance with this indicator were required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance
The state, through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional timeline data for initial evaluations in IMACS, verified that all districts with identified noncompliance were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year of notification.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

At 97.8%, the state is not meeting the target of 100%, but is continuing to address this indicator at a high rate of compliance. The 97.8% rate is a 1% increase from the previous year. It has been determined through a review of the improvement activities that no changes or additions need to be made at this time.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide training and professional development to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

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

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

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

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

Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under the category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of

updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise if necessary.

DESE Response

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

With 96.6% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2010–11, Missouri did not meet the target of 100% but continues to show a high degree of compliance with this indicator as well as improvement over the previous year.

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

Data for 2010–11 were gathered in the web-based IMACS which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay

- Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by Compliance Supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments.

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

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

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

Part C to Part B Referrals	
	2010–11
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination	217
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday	31
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	173
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	5
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	2
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday (# in a, but not b, c, d, or e)	6
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 Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible) = c / (a-b-d-e)	**96.6%**

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 107 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2010–11. A total of 52 of the 107 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend					
Year	2006-07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010-11
%	80.3%	88.6%	91.3%	95.0%	96.6%

Of the 13 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, all but five had their IEPs in place within one month of turning three. The five remaining children had their IEPs in place within two months of the third birthday.

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

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance

The state, through its follow-up procedures, which include submission of a second set of timeline data for

additional children transitioning from Part C to Part B, verified that all districts with identified noncompliance were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)
N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

The comparison of school years 2006–07 through 2010–11 shows a significant increase from 80.3% to 96.6% within acceptable timelines. It is believed that the progress on this indicator is due to a focus in both the Part B and C systems on training and technical assistance for Part C agencies and Part B Early Childhood Special Education staff. A large statewide training on C to B Transition with approximately 300 attendees from both the Part C and B systems was held in April 2010. Materials, including a videotape of the training, were posted on the web with notification of the availability of the materials sent out over the Part C and B listservs. C to B Transition was also a topic of discussion in several of the Assistant Commissioner's statewide webinars, as well as at regional and statewide conferences and meetings.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide training and professional development to all districts to improve collaboration and coordination with families and Part C agencies in the area of C to B Transition timelines.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Ongoing Training and Technical Assistance: RPDC Special Education Compliance Consultants work with Office of Special Education Supervisors to target the districts who need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance Supervisors notify RPDC Compliance Consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC Consultants assisted districts in determining the reasons for the delays and developing strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is invited to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies' knowledge regarding students transitioning from Part C to Part B.

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

The Department maintains a webpage specifically for Transition C to B topics in order to organize all transition training materials and technical assistance documents in one place. This page can be viewed at: http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/FirstSteps/Transitionindexpg.htm. Additionally, statewide Transition C to B trainings are conducted in the spring of every other year. This schedule was initiated in the spring of 2006, repeated in 2008 and again in 2010. This Part C/B joint training includes individual System Point of Entry (SPOE) regions and local school district early childhood special education staff. With technical assistance documents available online as well as an online training module, it was determined that biennial face-to-face trainings would be sufficient.

In 2010-11, listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year. Finally, in January 2011 a Part C to B Transition Webinar was conducted.

During 2010-11, the Department prepared a family information packet on Part C to Part B transition. This packet includes a DVD depicting the transition meeting and participation by early childhood programs at the local school district and community programs such as Head Start. The packet also includes a parent handbook covering basic information on the transition process. These packets are made available to families in the Part C system as the Service Coordinator and family begin discussions about the transition from First Steps to Part B or other services. They are also provided to ECSE program staff.

Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

With a compliance rate of 79.4%, the state did not meet the 100% target for 2010–11 and showed slippage from the previous year.

Indicator 13 Actual Target Data: 2009–10 and 2010–11			
Year	Number of Transition Plans Reviewed	Number that Met Standard	Percent that Met Standard
2009–10	587	536	91.3%
2010–11	569	452	**79.4%**

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance The state, through its follow-up procedures, which include submission of additional documentation of transition plans, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that all individual child noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

Actual target data shows a significant drop in compliance from 2009–10 (91.3%) and 2010–11 (79.4%). During the 2010–11 monitoring year, the Office of Special Education Compliance Section determined that there was a need to change the procedures for monitoring certain criteria under indicator 13. At the time the decision was made, it was anticipated that this change would impact our compliance percentage until all districts could be retrained on the new criteria. A training plan has been developed and is being implemented. It is anticipated that the percentage will improve with the next APR and continue to improve in the future.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide professional development/training on effective practices in post secondary transition planning to state, regional and district staff.
- Manage and support a web-based data system to track improved performance in effective transition planning.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting, or in danger of not meeting, state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Provide training and technical assistance on the Transition Outcomes Project (TOPs) to all districts in order to have districts at 100% compliance on Indicator 13.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Manage and Support a Web-Based Data System: See APR Overview under category labeled “Transition Outcomes Project (TOP).”

Provide Professional Development and Training: See APR Overview under category labeled “Missouri Resources (MORE).”

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Recruit and Develop Models of Success: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Training and Technical Assistance on Transition Outcomes Project (TOPs): See APR Overview under category labeled “Transition Outcomes Project (TOP).”

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities. However, two additional improvement activities regarding Check and Connect have been added to the SPP.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance

with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

After an evaluation of the improvement activities for this indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-2011	A: 24.4% B: 46.9% C: 51.3%

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Graduate and Dropout Follow-up Data						
2010–11Follow-up Data	2009–10 Graduates		2009–10 Dropouts		2009–10 Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) 4 - Year College	648	9.3%	8	0.6%	656	7.9%
(2) 2 - Year College	1,803	26.0%	54	3.9%	1,857	22.3%
(3) Non – College	248	3.6%	11	0.8%	259	3.1%
(4) Competitive Employment	1,648	23.7%	114	8.3%	1,762	21.2%
(5) Noncompetitive Employment	187	2.7%	9	0.7%	196	2.4%
(6) Military	144	2.1%	0	0.0%	144	1.7%
(7) Continuing Education – did not complete one term	317	4.6%	2	0.1%	319	3.8%
(8) Employed – less than 20 hours/week or 90 days	274	3.9%	32	2.3%	306	3.7%
(9) Other	940	13.5%	226	16.5%	1,166	14.0%
(10)Unknown	735	10.6%	915	66.7%	1,650	19.8%
Total Follow-up	6,944	100.0%	1,371	100.0%	8,315	100.0%

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

Categories (mutually exclusive)	**Number**	**Percent**
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school [(1) + (2)]	2,513	30.2%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education) [(4) + (6)]	1,906	22.9%
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) [(3)]	259	3.1%
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed) [(5)]	196	2.4%
Other categories [(7) + (8) + (9) + (10)	3,441	41.4%
Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,315	100.0%

Summary Measures (Baseline Data)	**Number**	**Percent**
A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)]	2,513	30.2%
B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)]	4,419	53.1%
C: Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6)]	4,874	58.6%
Total Graduates and Dropouts	8,315	

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

At 30.2%, 53.1% and 58.6%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statements A (24.4%), B (46.9%) and C (51.3%) respectively.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting, or in danger of not meeting, state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Provide professional development/technical assistance to districts on data collection for this indicator.
- Support implementation of Project Search to improve employment outcomes for students with disabilities.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices: The Office of Special Education contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary to create an evidence-based practice piece to follow TOPs training in the form of a best-practice website. The goal of this website is to provide tools districts can use to begin to understand what works in improving the outcomes of youth with disabilities. Districts can review their post school outcomes and make decisions regarding what areas they would like to implement improvement strategies. The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center in-school "predictors" of post school success in the areas of employment, education, and independent living for youth with disabilities, are placed in rubrics to allow school teams to understand the definition of each one.

The Rubrics provide (a) conversation starters so the predictors can be more easily understood and discussed; (b) three levels of district implementation towards implementation excellence; and (c) types of evidence the district can view to validate their level of implementation. There are also areas for districts to record the types of evidence reviewed and the conversation around the particular predictor. The Resources Repository can then be searched by predictor category so districts can quickly locate high quality resources and evidence-based lesson plans. This website will be ready for dissemination in the 2011-12 school year.

Recruit and Develop "Models of Success" in Post Secondary Transition: See Indicator 1 of this APR for a description of this activity.

Provide Professional Development/Technical Assistance to Districts on Data Collection for this Indicator: A webinar was conducted on December 10, 2010, on reporting of student follow-up data. This webinar reviewed the reporting of follow-up data for the previous year's graduates and dropouts, including the students for which follow-up is required, the codes and definitions used for the collection and the usage of the data.

The reporting of follow-up data was also reviewed at various conferences including the New Special Education Directors' Institute and the Special Education Administrators' Conference.

Support Implementation of Project SEARCH to Improve Employment Outcomes for Students with Disabilities: In preparation for adding demonstration sites for Project SEARCH in Missouri, staff met with Erin Reihle from the Cincinnati Children's Hospital and the founder of the program. Reihle presented at the 2011 Transition Institute to create an awareness of the program. In addition, the one existing Missouri Project SEARCH site also presented at the Institute. Funds were budgeted in the 2011–12 budget to disseminate in the 2011–12 school years. Outcomes for Project SEARCH will be reported in the 2013 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary to the existing improvement activities.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Missouri met the 100% target for correction of noncompliance within 12 months.

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

A total of 116 public school districts and seven charter schools had monitoring reports issued during 2009–10, resulting in a total of 123 responsible public agencies. The Special Education monitoring follows the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district is reviewed once within the five-year cycle of the MSIP. For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled "4th Cycle Focus on SPP Indicators." Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # of LEAs issued findings in 2009–10 – the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2009–10
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2009–10 – the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area
- # of Findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities:	26	46	46
	Dispute Resolution:	2	2	2
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution:	13	34	34
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities:	16	39	39
	Dispute Resolution:	2	2	2
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education	Monitoring Activities:	56	253	253

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Dispute Resolution:	8	9	9
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution:	1	1	1
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities:	73	320	320
	Dispute Resolution:	2	2	2
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities:	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities:	33	72	72
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			785	785
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			**(b) / (a) X 100 =**	**100.0%**

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance

Missouri had 100% of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2009 timely corrected and verified within one year of notification, including correction of all individual noncompliance. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification in 100% of the files reviewed. The state also verified that, in addition to the findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

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

Improvement activities for 2010–11included the following:

- Implement a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans.
- Manage general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.
- Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide a Comprehensive General Supervision System to Ensure Timely Correction of Noncompliance: As the Department prepared to enter into a new Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) five-year monitoring cycle in 2006–07, the Office of Special Education worked closely with the NCSEAM and several groups of stakeholders on focused monitoring procedures. As described in the APR Overview, the procedures focus strongly on the SPP performance areas by establishing criteria for Graduation and Dropout Rates, Performance on Statewide Assessments and LRE. Districts not meeting the established criteria are required to complete both a self-assessment file review using related compliance indicators and an improvement plan related to those performance areas. Results of the self assessment (file review) are verified through an Office of Special Education desk review, and Improvement Plans are also reviewed using a scoring guide developed with the assistance of the NCRRC. See the APR overview for a description of focused monitoring on-site reviews in 4th cycle. This monitoring system rewards districts that are demonstrating solid performance in key SPP areas.

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

The Office of Special Education verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09–02.

Districts must also correct findings of non-compliance on an individual child basis within 90 days of the receipt of the report of noncompliance. Compliance Supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services, evaluations completed) have been put in place. Districts do not receive a report of correction of all noncompliance until this process is complete.

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

Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Corrective Action Plans: Many strategies are in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance within 12 months. Emphasis is placed upon ensuring that Department Compliance Supervisors have a heightened awareness of the districts that have need of technical assistance in order to correct non-compliance. An agenda item in regular staff meetings with Compliance Supervisors addresses districts that are out of compliance, and the progress being made with those districts to correct their non-compliance. When a Supervisor encounters difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance Consultant assigned to the district is contacted and asked to make a personal visit to the district to provide assistance.

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

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

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

Manage System to Ensure Timely Correction of Noncompliance: IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor district evidence of correction of non-compliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction to Compliance Supervisors. Regular staff meetings with Compliance Supervisors and weekly phone calls with the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. Staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of non-compliance.

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

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

Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies for Improving Performance on this Indicator: See APR Overview under category labeled "Missouri Resources (MORE)."

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet. In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

DESE Response

See activity descriptions above for follow-up procedures for correct implementation of specific regulatory requirements and correction of individual noncompliance.

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

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60-day or extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

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

Child Complaints

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Within 60-days	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60-day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60-day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60-days or extended timelines
2005-06	104	92	76	16	0	100.0%
2006-07	99	81	75	6	0	100.0%
2007–08	77	63	57	6	0	100.0%
2008–09	92	72	69	3	0	100.0%
2009–10	106	87	83	4	0	100.0%
2010–11	58	48	48	0	0	**100.0%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

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

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60-day timeline for resolution of child complaints.
- Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Maintain Compliance with Child Complaint Timelines: The Department continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Database reports are reviewed weekly to ensure that timelines are met and that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Complaint System Online Stakeholder Training: In April 2011, the Office of Special Education staff updated the 2007 web-based video and conducted a webinar to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints and a Checklist of What to Expect During the Child Complaint Process for parents and districts. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 days or appropriately extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Three due process hearings were filed and fully adjudicated during 2010–11. One was completed within timelines with no extension and the other two were completed within timelines with appropriate extension, resulting in 100% compliance for this indicator.

Due Process Hearing Requests

Year	Fully Adjudicated Hearings (by June 30)	Fully Adjudicated Hearings within timeline or within extended timeline	Fully Adjudicated Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2005–06	2	2	0	100.0%
2006–07	3	3	0	100.0%
2007–08	1	1	0	100.0%
2008–09	3	2	1	66.7%
2009–10	2	2	0	100.0%
2010–11	3	3	0	**100.0%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

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

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide online training of due process requirements, including timelines, to all hearing officers.
- Manage due process system to ensure hearing chairs are in full compliance with contract provisions including timelines.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Online Training of Due Process Requirements, Including Timelines, to All Hearing Officers: The Office of Special Education is in the process of developing online training and anticipates it to be functional in spring 2012. At the present time, the Office of Special Education keeps hearing officers updated of due process requirements through print communication and regular webinars. Finally, in September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents,

districts, advocates and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

Manage Due Process System to Ensure Hearing Chairs Are in Full Compliance with Contract Provisions Including Timelines: In August 2011, a letter was sent from the Office of Special Education to all hearing chairs to inform them of their contractual requirements to ensure that due process timelines are met. The Department continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for completion of fully adjudicated due process hearings. Database reports are reviewed weekly to ensure that timelines are met and that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	35.3% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

At 19.6% of resolution sessions resulting in settlement agreements, Missouri did not meet the target of 35.3% established for the 2010–11 school year.

2005–06 to 2010–11 Resolution Session and Settlement Agreement Trend Data						
	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41	25	29	51
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20	11	16	10
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	48.8%	44.0%	55.2%	**19.6%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

The data for 2010–11 shows a significant decrease from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. An analysis of due process data revealed that over half of the resolution sessions that were held but did not reach a settlement agreement were ultimately withdrawn.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Collect Information Regarding Resolution Session Outcomes to Improve Data Collection: During 2010–11, procedures were developed and implemented to track and follow-up on resolution session timelines and outcomes. SEA staff are assigned when a request for a Due Process Hearing is filed. Staff communicates with the LEA to remind them of the requirement to conduct a Resolution Session and of the timelines. Follow-up communication is conducted until the session is held and an outcome determined or until one or both parties agrees not to conduct the Resolution Session and to proceed with the Due Process Hearing.

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is

also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and is posted on the Office of Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review indicated no need for revision at this time.

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent's Act [MPACT]) as part of their contractual agreement with the Department provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions. In 2009–10, MPACT conducted trainings for 198 parents and 36 professionals on Disagreement Resolution. They also provided one-one-one assistance for 230 parents concerning due process and resolution.

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

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	35.3% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

Missouri met the 2010–11 target with 95.3% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

2005–06 to 2010–11 Mediation Agreement Trend Data			
	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%
2007–08	11	17	64.7%
2008–09	13	16	81.3%
2009–10	27	30	90.0%
2010–11	41	43	**95.3%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

With 95.3% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.3% for 2010–11.

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Provide information on the Missouri complaint system through the Parent's Guide to Special Education.

Improvement Activity Discussion

Provide Information on the Missouri Complaint System through the Parents Guide to Special Education: An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. An Addendum to the Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in June 2010 due to changes in Federal and

State Regulations. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and approximately 750 copies were mailed during 2010–11. It is also posted on the Office of Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In April 2011, the Office of Special Education staff updated the 2007 web-based video and conducted a webinar to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system as well highlighting the use of mediation prior to as well as during the complaint process. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent's Act [MPACT]) as part of their contractual agreement with the Department provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions. In 2010–11, MPACT conducted trainings for 236 parents and 63 professionals on Disagreement Resolution. They also provided one-on-one assistance for 181 parents concerning the resolution and mediation processes.

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

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010–11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010–11	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2010–11

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

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

- **MOSIS:** MOSIS is the Department's student-level collection system. MOSIS is taking the previous aggregate core data collection system to the student level. The data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, placement, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. These data are also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 14. MOSIS includes a variety of data edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy of data
- **Core Data Collection System:** Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. Most of the collections for student data are now being populated with data from the MOSIS system. The collections populated with MOSIS data continue to utilize edit checking logic as a second screening of the data
- **Missouri Assessment Program (MAP):** MAP data are used by the Department for NCLB/AYP reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data are used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3
- **IMACS:** the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Transition Plans (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15). IMACS is also used to conduct disproportionality reviews (APR 9/10)
- **Dispute Resolution Database:** the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to

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

- **Other:** The data collections for Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2010–11. The results are below:

Indicator 20 Data			
APR Indicator	**Valid and Reliable**	**Correct Calculation**	**Total**
1	1	NA	1
2	1	NA	1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	40
APR Score Calculation	**Timely Submission Points** – If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total – Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		45.00

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	**Timely**	**Complete Data**	**Passed Edit Check**	**Responded to Data Note Requests**	**Total**
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 12/15/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 8 – MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
				Subtotal	22
618 Score Calculation			**Grand Total** (Subtotal x 2.045)		45.00

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	45.00
B. 618 Grand Total	45.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	90.00
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	90.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	**100.00%**

As indicated above, state reported data for 2010–11 were submitted in a timely fashion and were accurate as defined by OSEP's scoring rubric.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010–11

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2010–11.

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

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the new MOSIS collection system which populates the web-based core data collection system. Manuals with reporting instructions and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and core data systems. New Special Education Directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Department staff. The end-of-year collections for 2007–08 were the first special education collections to be collected solely through MOSIS. Throughout 2010–11, Office of Data System Management Special Education staff worked extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level

- Data editing and validation are handled by Department staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting
- Staff working with Special Education data serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various Department programs are met
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data
- Data gathered through IMACS all undergo verification by Compliance Supervisors , and the Supervisors' determinations supersede district responses if different

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

2010–11 Improvement Activities

- Support the development and implementation of MOSIS.
- Provide information to State Supervisors of Instruction and school administrators regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA.
- Develop and manage web-based data system (FormHog) for management of contracts and data collection for statewide initiatives (SW-PBS, MIM, RtI and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)).

Improvement Activity Discussion

MOSIS: As noted above, the Department has fully implemented a student-level data collection system. Staff who work with special education data are part of a Department workgroup that identified and defined the necessary data elements. The Department has worked to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. Extensive technical assistance to districts ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

During 2009–10, the Department finalized and implemented a rubric for evaluating the timeliness and accuracy of district data submissions. Deadlines by which data must be certified through MOSIS were established and tracked. A system was put in place to regularly contact districts who had not yet certified their data in order to help them meet the deadline. For the 2010–11 school year, three districts did not meet the deadline for the educator course/assignment submission and four districts did not meet the deadline for the discipline submission. This was an improvement over the timeliness of submissions for the 2009–10 school year.

Staff work closely with districts to resolve accuracy issues, therefore all districts received full credit for the accuracy of data submissions.

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

FormHog: The Office of Special Education has contracted with the company FormHog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line contract development and management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all

information related to vendor contracts (e.g. contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, as well as processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

In addition to the contract development and management system, FormHog, Inc. has developed and provided on-line district data collection systems for the SW-PBS and MIM statewide initiatives. Data have been collected in these systems on an annual basis since the 2008–09 school year from districts involved in each initiative. In 2010–11, district data collection systems for the RtI and NDPC-SD initiatives were added. The district data collection systems allow district staff to enter data as specified for the various initiatives in a standardized format. Statewide users can manage and manipulate the data by using the data query and reporting tool in the FormHog system to evaluate activities on a district, regional and statewide level.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010–11

After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that no revisions were necessary.

MO FFY 2009 (2009–10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

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