

**ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
REPORT  
MISSOURI PART B  
2012-13**

## 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 .....	15
Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:.....	17
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.....	17
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs .....	17
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.....	17
Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion: .....	22
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.....	22
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.....	22
Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:.....	28
A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; .....	28
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and .....	28
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements .....	28
Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:.....	31
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and.....	31
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.....	31
Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: .....	35
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); .....	35
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and.....	35
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)).....	35
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.....	48
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: .....	65
A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.....	65
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. ....	65

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.....	65
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.....	75
Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.....	76
Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.....	78
Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.....	80

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13 Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2012-13 (Federal Fiscal Year 2012 which covers the time period from July 1, 2012, to June 30, 2013).

### 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. An internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities has been 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), Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) prior to submission for their review and input.

### Data Collection and Reporting

#### Public Reporting of District Data

Public reports of 2012-13 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (the Department) Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal website. The Special Education Profiles are posted under Summary Reports at [mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx](http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx). 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.

#### Public Reporting of Statewide Data

The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at [dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf](http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf) as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. 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/se/SPPpage.html](http://dese.mo.gov/se/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 transitioned 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 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, processing invoices and reviewing reports.

### **Data Team Training**

During the 2011-12 school year the Department partnered with the Leadership and Learning Center to train State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) staff in a Decision Making for Results (DMR) and Data Teams (DT) 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 identifying successful teaching and leadership practices that serve as measureable indicators within an effective holistic accountability system.

### **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 are used to address districts' performance on the SPP Indicators. The components of the system include 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 both the cyclical and annual review processes. 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.

#### **Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators**

Historically, the special education monitoring schedule has been tied to the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). MSIP is the state's general school accreditation system which reviewed all districts during a five year cycle. As a response to revisions to the MSIP process in 2011-12, the Department initiated a transition from a five year to a three year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education.

Each cohort includes approximately one-third of the districts in the state (including public charter schools and other public agencies responsible for provision of educational services). Districts in each cohort were selected based on size within each region and across the state. This assured an equal distribution of the 564 districts in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium and small districts from urban, suburban and rural settings. Districts also represent the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

This monitoring/general supervision system is a tiered monitoring process including the following four tiers: desk audit, desk review, phone audit and onsite monitoring. Based upon threshold levels related to the targets established in the SPP, districts are required to complete self assessment activities related to the identified SPP targets not met. If, during their tiered monitoring year, a district did not meet a performance threshold, the district is required to conduct focused 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 (OSE) 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. The Office of Special Education also 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 are requested as part of a follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and districts may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified. Districts are expected to correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days, but in no case more than 12 months, of the receipt of the report of findings of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. 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. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months when they attend the required self-assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance.

### **Onsite Reviews**

The Office of Special Education's focused monitoring process is part of the three year cohort for all federal programs' tiered monitoring. In 2012-13, nine agencies were selected for onsite monitoring reviews based upon data analysis demonstrating the need for improvement in providing high quality staff, incidence rates, placement rates of students with disabilities and complaint system identified noncompliance. Two of the districts were also monitored for compliance with the Speech Implementer model for providing services to students with disabilities. While onsite, the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff as well as file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered was reviewed by the team and used to identify areas of noncompliance. Exit conferences were held with district staff to report the team's findings and answer any questions from the districts.

Within four weeks of the review, the districts received reports of the onsite review which identified any noncompliance and included a corrective action plan, when necessary. The districts were required to correct both individual noncompliance identified and provide evidence of compliance for all identified areas within one year of the report.

### **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. A Local Education Agency (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. LEAs 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<sup>th</sup> each year.

LEAs 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 LEA during the school year

- Of the students who had IEPs during this school year, the number that had received CEIS using IDEA funds anytime in the past two school years

LEAs 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 Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with Department staff from the Special Education Compliance, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections.

Upon review of LEA documentation, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

### **Program Development**

During the 2012-13 school year, Missouri began implementing a statewide collaborative improvement initiative intended to greatly improve student outcomes. This initiative connects buildings/districts in each region of the state to share lessons, common formative assessments, effective teaching/learning practices and collaborative data practices to accelerate Missouri achievement for all students, but especially students with disabilities. Because the money used previously for Special Education Improvement Grants will now be used to support this initiative, the state will no longer issue Improvement Grants to districts. Therefore, districts will not be required to write and submit improvement plans for the purpose of grant application. District needs and areas of improvement will be addressed and monitored through the statewide Collaborative Work (CW) initiative.

### **Collaborative Work (CW)**

The Office of Special Education offered school districts/buildings the opportunity to participate in a statewide collaborative work initiative to improve student outcomes. Participating districts/buildings receive a small grant award based on participating school building population to help offset costs of implementing project activities.

### **Desired outcome from the Collaborative Work**

- Improved outcomes for all students, but especially students with disabilities.
- Change in adult behavior: Through high quality professional development (HQPD), teachers and administrators (a) establish and implement effective and efficient collaborative data teams, (b) implement with fidelity and a high degree of effectiveness a variety of instructional practices which have been proven to have a high effect size on student outcomes, (c) develop and administer common formative assessments to measure the effectiveness of instruction as evidenced by student mastery of learning objectives, and (d) use data-based decision-making to guide decisions about classroom learning and instruction.

**Major components**

<b>Effective Teaching and Learning Practices</b>	<b>Common Formative Assessments</b>	<b>Data-Based Decision-Making</b>
Collaborative Data Teams help each other learn to select and use effective teaching and learning practices which are intentionally used to improve student outcomes	Collaborative Data Teams use common formative assessments to monitor the value of the teaching and learning practices and of student acquisition of knowledge and skills	Collaborative data teams collectively analyze data to determine who needs more help and what practices are most likely to work for re-teaching. Re-testing validates their decisions.

**Major expectations for Implementation Integrity**

- All work is aligned with the Missouri Learning Standards and Teacher/Leader Standards
- Building administrators
  - Assure that the participation expectations and agreements have been shared with all instructional staff
  - Assure that all instructional staff will be trained and participate on building collaborative data teams
  - Provide support to instructional staff who have expertise in an effective teaching practice to coach and mentor colleagues
  - Support and oversee the collaborative team process
  - New staff will be trained/mentored on the collaborative work
- All teachers (including Special Education and special subjects music, art, p.e., etc.) actively participate on a collaborative data team
  - Small buildings may only have one team covering all grade levels.
  - Larger buildings may have 2 or more teams—some could have one per grade level.
- Each building
  - Identifies a content area of English Language Arts or mathematics on which to focus their attention and to report progress
  - Selects the “effective” teaching/learning practices for the year that all teachers will agree to use as part of the teaching/learning process.
- Each building level collaborative data team
  - Develops, administers, scores and analyzes the results of grade appropriate common formative assessments aligned to a core academic standard.
- The common formative assessments are shared through a web-based program with other buildings in the region on a monthly basis following the initial development of the assessment.
- A summary analysis based on the formative assessment is shared with the RPDC consultant at the time the building submits the formative assessment. Basic information included in the summary analysis is:
  - Missouri Learning Standard addressed
  - Teaching/learning practice used
  - Number and percent of students assessed in the grade-level
  - Number and percent of all students (including students with IEPs) in each performance level on the assessment based on the initial administration
  - Number and percent of students with IEPs only in each performance level on the assessment based on the initial administration
  - Teaching/learning practice used to re-teach students in the far to go (likely to become proficient), and Intervention students (not likely to become proficient)
  - Number and percent of all students and students with IEPs in each performance level based on a re-test.

**Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS)**

The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

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

- State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- Secondary/Tertiary Consultants (6)
- Regional Consultants (21)

The state coordinator guides the implementation of the 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. Other primary responsibilities include revising the current scope and sequence of training across all three tiers and collaborating with regional consultants to ensure the training content aligns with the scope and sequence; coordinating the State Leadership Team; collaborating with other state initiatives, Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) directors, and Department personnel; and assuring that the work of all consultants is aligned with their responsibilities as outlined in their scopes of work.

The data/web consultant is in the process of formalizing a cohesive system of MO SW-PBS data collection available for review at school, 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 schools/districts 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 school- and district-level support across a spectrum of implementation areas.

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at school, district, regional, and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with both the National Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the Missouri University (MU) PBIS Center which are supported by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The MO SW-PBS initiative has expanded from 275 schools in 2006 to 740 schools in 2013 at the elementary and secondary levels. Data collected through the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and the state-developed MO SW-PBS School Data Profile, along with other Department data sources, indicate that schools/districts participating in the state SW-PBS initiative show improvements in student attendance, achievement, and placement in the least restrictive environment.

Active MO SW-PBS schools are categorized into an implementation phase based on established criteria. The categories include Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver, and Gold. In June 2013, 312 schools were recognized for having met the criteria for Bronze, Silver, or Gold levels. These schools 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 MO SW-PBS, including schools serving as demonstration sites, may be accessed at [www.pbissmissouri.org](http://www.pbissmissouri.org).

**Response to Intervention (RTI)**

Many projects previously associated with this work ended during 2012-13. School improvement efforts within the Department began moving toward integration of research-based practices within prevention/intervention models with an initial focus on practices used at the universal level. The activities below describe RTI efforts over the last year.

### Alignment Group

The Missouri Alignment Group, comprised of Department staff representing RTI, School Wide-Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) staff met monthly through the summer of 2013. The purpose of the meetings was to continue to share information and begin identifying commonalities in practice across the initiatives. This group continues to meet with a focus on developing a MTSS Framework for implementation in the state.

### RTI Development Sites

During 2012-13, technical assistance was provided to each site in accordance with its self-identified needs. Topic areas relating to refinement of data collection and analysis such as:

- intensification of instruction through the use of interventions matched to student need,
- testing the efficacy of interventions provided, and
- using development site data to demonstrate strategies for linking summative and formative assessments together into a comprehensive data-based decision-making framework to set and maintain high expectations across the school year.

Below is a brief summary of the specific work in each site:

High school setting: The Coordinator provided assistance regarding the selection of variables best suited to screening students and identifying students at risk. Additionally, advice was provided on the management of data for the purposes of aggregating data by class for screening purposes.

K-8 building: The Coordinator provided professional development to teachers and administrators on formulating reading intervention instruction in the lower grades that linked with Tier 1 instruction and that filled between-grade gaps in skill development.

Elementary Schools: The coordinator met with administrators to discuss their goals to unify intervention instruction across buildings in the district. The group decided to conduct a needs assessment that could detail where teachers in all buildings and grade levels were in their approaches to formulating intervention instruction. The Coordinator developed and administered a survey, collected and analyzed data, conducted follow-up interviews with teachers and generated conclusions and recommendations. This information was summarized into a report for the district organized by grade.

### Early Childhood in RTI

Collaboration continued with two of the RTI development site school districts, the University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, and The Center for RTI in Early Childhood (CRTIEC). In September, the Coordinator presented implementation and assessment findings at CRTIEC's annual meeting at the invitation of CRTIEC staff. The conference provided an opportunity for face-to-face collaboration and planning with CRTIEC colleagues.

Two additional sites were added to this work. More classrooms were needed to implement both treatment and comparison intervention conditions. Data from the two conditions could then be compared to understand whether the treatment condition that included the specialized instruction was more effective at promoting vocabulary learning than the listening center with no specialized instruction (the story was simply narrated for listeners). Overall results were similar to those of last year. The vocabulary measures showed little gain and the comprehension measures indicated modest gains. Note that the spring measures are more difficult than the fall measures so that a typically-developing student's score would remain the same from fall to spring. Growth in the comprehension measure indicates that students are gaining comprehension skills at a faster than normal rate, which is desirable in an early intervention program. A rhyming measure was administered for the first time this year at the request of one site which wanted to focus on phonological awareness. This measure showed marked gains from fall to spring.

**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 tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model included 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 2010-11 school year. The scaled-up buildings included three elementary buildings, three middle schools and five high schools. A critical element of the pilot was 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. In September 2012, the state requested and was granted a one year no cost extension for this project. During this extension year, the districts/buildings developed and implemented sustainability plans. The Implementation Facilitators (IF) continued to work with their buildings on these plans as well as to develop coaching tools based upon their experiences over the past five years. Tools, products and procedures developed as a result of this project will be finalized and refined for widespread dissemination. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at [www.mimschools.org](http://www.mimschools.org).

As stated above, the Missouri SPDG MIM project received a no-cost extension for 2012-13 to support continued efforts to improve sustainability. During 2012-13, the IFs continued to work with their schools/districts to support teaming processes, continue the Action Planning process, and ensure fidelity of implementation. Responses to the School Staff Survey in 2012-13 showed continued gains in teachers' use of research-based models of instruction and data-based decision making. Schools continued to report data on students' academic and behavioral achievement.

Additionally, each school created a Sustainability Plan at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year, then implemented the plan throughout the year. Strategies for sustainability included strengthening the schools' capacity for coaching, continuing to use data-based decision-making practices, planning for ongoing professional development in initiatives, such as SW-PBS and RTI, and increasing communication with parents about school initiatives.

Overall, the MIM proved to be a highly successful initiative. Data show that throughout the MIM funding period, both academic and behavioral achievement improved for students with disabilities in participating buildings. Teachers in MIM buildings showed increased participation in professional development and adoption of the 11 essential features. Furthermore, self-reported data from all students and the parents of students with disabilities showed increases in satisfaction with the education provided, parental involvement, and student engagement in classroom and school activities. All of these data support the conclusion that the MIM succeeded in accomplishing its stated goal of improving statewide and district level systems of educational support for children and youth with disabilities. Through the sustainability process established during the 2012-13 school year, the MIM model will continue to be implemented with fidelity and will therefore continue improving outcomes for current and future students.

In October of 2012, the state was awarded a new SPDG grant (see above under "Collaborative Work". The OSE is using many of the processes developed and lessons learned from the MIM to inform the work of the current SPDG.

**State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) 2012**

In October 2012, the state was awarded a new five-year SPDG. This SPDG is using lessons learned from the prior grant (MIM) to begin implementing a more focused school improvement process with an emphasis

on High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) at the state, regional, district and building levels on four areas of focus: Collaborative Data Teams, Effective Teaching/Learning Practices, Formative Assessment and Data-based Decision-making (see "Collaborative Work" above). Buildings with low achievement overall or with an achievement gap between all students and students with disabilities were identified throughout the state. During the 2012-13 school year, 270 buildings (mostly elementary buildings) volunteered to participate in the Collaborative Work project. In 2013-14, 90 buildings were added for a total of 370, including Middle and High Schools. With the support of technology, PD in the four focus areas has been developed and used to train state and regional staff who are working with staff in the identified buildings. Building staff have formed collaborative data teams that identify effective teaching/learning practices to implement in a selected area (English/Language Arts or Math). All staff were then trained in the practice. After training, staff develop and administer Common Formative Assessments to measure student progress and using a data team process, identify students for re-teaching and retesting. A cadre of State Implementation Specialists (SIS) have been trained and are evaluating the activities of the project to ensure that all activities meet standards of High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) and are implemented with fidelity at all levels of the system. The overall goal of this project is improved outcomes for all students, but especially for students with disabilities.

**Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech (TtS) Pilot** During 2011-12, 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 utilized technology rich classrooms, TtS software and ongoing professional development to support and increase student achievement.

In 2011-12 the project began a recruiting drive to get more schools to participate in the project; however, this recruiting project was not successful. After an evaluation of this project, the Office of Special Education made a decision to discontinue the TtS project at the end of the 2011-12 school year due to the low number of buildings/students involved compared to the cost of the project.

**National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD):** In 2008–09, through an extensive needs assessment and data analysis, the 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 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 2011-12 school year a second cohort of Model Schools was added which included seven additional schools. These schools received training from the NDPC-SD during the 2011-12 school year. They attended the first Missouri Dropout Prevention Summit in Jefferson City and the NDPC-SD Dropout Summit in Baltimore.

In the 2012-13 school year the Department collected action plans from the pilot schools in order to track progress and plan technical assistance and support for staff from the pilot schools. The Missouri pilot schools presented at the 2013 Dropout Summit in Jefferson City sponsored by DESE. Initial data show both Cohort 1 and cohort 2 schools are being successful in reducing their dropout rate and increasing persistence to graduation. Cohort 1 schools collectively report a 3 year decrease in dropout rates for students with disabilities of 1.85% and an increase in 3 year graduation rates of 32.5%. Cohort 2 schools collectively report a 2.06% decrease in dropout rates and a 64.11% increase in graduation rates.

The DESE hosted a dropout summit during the summer of 2013 to provide additional training in the six essential elements of dropout prevention. This summit was open to all Missouri schools as well as model schools. The primary themes of this summit were parent involvement, cultural competency and student engagement.

The Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) consultants who work with the area of post secondary transition received training during the 2011-12 school year to provide training and support to Cohort 1 and 2 schools and to build capacity to support additional schools in the coming year. They provided technical assistance to both cohort 1 and cohort 2 schools during the 2012-13 school year.

### **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 implementation of a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the students' post school goals.
- Empowers local school offices of special education to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs and approaches.

The OSE contracted with Dr. O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide TOP training to Department staff, RPDC transition consultants and selected districts. The RPDC compliance consultants attended a session with Dr. O'Leary in 2012 to qualify them as TOP trainers. Since the 2008-09 school year a total of 182 districts have received TOP training.

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 LEA staff to do a self-assessment of post-secondary transition requirements and track their progress in developing IEPs which meet compliance with Indicator 13.

## **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:

- Twenty (20) special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development to both special and general education teachers and administrators and provide ongoing coaching related to improving performance for students with disabilities.
- 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.
- Six (6) compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to districts to assist them to understand IDEA compliance requirements, conduct compliance self-reviews, and write and implement 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-four (24) PLC consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

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

### **Project ACCESS**

Created in 1985, Project ACCESS was one of the first state resource centers for autism in the nation. Project ACCESS is located at Missouri State University (MSU) and is funded 100% by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Project ACCESS provides autism and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD) resource information, professional development and technical assistance to public schools across Missouri.

In addition, Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials 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. Onsite 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). Thirty-six (36) new IDACs were trained by Project ACCESS credentialed staff during the 2012-13 school year.

As part of the Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative, which is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD, Project ACCESS assigned BEAT coaches to participating districts throughout Missouri and coaches were chosen to aid specific districts based on Project ACCESS criteria. Twenty-three school districts and one cooperative consisting of 13 school districts were served through BEAT coaches during the 2012-13 year, with 113 school visits conducted. One rural school district consisting of 10 widely dispersed facilities was also provided with special training for paraprofessionals, as well as 5 additional professional development trainings for special educators as well as regular educators. Working with Students with Autism in the Schools (WASS) and an In-district Autism Consultant training was also provided. The cooperative was provided with an Introduction to Autism and WASS training as well.

The Project ACCESS website ([www.education.missouristate.edu/access/](http://www.education.missouristate.edu/access/)) had 116,921 page views from 24,627 unique users during the 2012-2013 year. Data analysis showed that 42% of the unique users were new visitors to the site, while 58% were returning visitors. Three webinars were presented in 2012-13 regarding various aspects of ASD. These webinars will be archived on the website and available for future viewing.

Project ACCESS provided scholarships to 167 educators from school districts throughout Missouri to attend a variety of trainings designed to increase capacity, including: Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS), Strategies for Teaching based on Autism Research (STAR), the Ziggurat Model, Social Thinking, and Assessment of Functional Living Skills.

### **TheSource**

The Department, in conjunction with the NCRRC, supports the “TheSource” 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 (Rtl)

Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-Based Practice, Online Resource and Definition. The site, originally called "MORE", was updated and reintroduced in 2012-13 as "TheSource" and remarketed to the public. The revisions included adding a survey for users to provide feedback on the usefulness and quality of the site and its resources. The site can be accessed at <http://thesource.northcentralrrc.org/>.

### **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 Department personnel. This Standards-Based IEP training takes the participant through the steps of a planning process 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 2012-13 school year, RPDC consultants held ten standards-based IEP trainings across the state with a total of 193 participants. The OSE is currently in the process of updating this module to align with the Missouri Learning Standards.

### **Evaluation**

#### **SPP Improvement Activity Evaluation**

The OSE 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 OSE staff in an improvement activity evaluation model. Using this model, OSE 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 continued during the 2012-13 school year. The 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/se/SPPpage.html](http://dese.mo.gov/se/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 adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	70.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities
2012-13	71.5% graduation rate for students with disabilities

### Actual Target Data for 2012-13

The graduation rate data reported below are the 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). Per instructions for the APR in the Measurement Table, 2011-12 data is reported; however, in order to align with the data reported for the 2012-13 CSPR, 2012-13 data are also reported.

**WILL NEED TO CHECK 2012 AND 2013 DATA AGAINST CSPR REPORTING PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO OSEP.**

Missouri Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Data			
Year	Number of Four-Year Graduates with IEPs	Special Education Adjusted Cohort	Graduation Rate
2010-11	6,818	9,944	68.6%
2011-12	5,874	8,066	<b>72.8%</b>
2012-13	5,845	7,983	<b>73.2%</b>

Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate = (Number of graduates within four years with IEPs / Number in Special Education cohort) x 100

Missouri Five-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Data			
Year	Number of Five-Year Graduates with IEPs	Special Education Adjusted Cohort	Graduation Rate
2010-11	7,336	9,818	74.7%
2011-12	6,367	8,293	76.8%

Five-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate = (Number of graduates within five years with IEPs / Number in Special Education cohort) x 100

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

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

- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.

- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:
  1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
  2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
  3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.
- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

Using 2011-12 data as the baseline, targets for 2011-12 and 2012-13 were revised to reflect the calculation change to the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and to align with Missouri's approved ESEA Flexibility Application. For this APR, Missouri's 2011-12 graduation rate of 72.8% meets and exceeds the revised target of 70.0%.

In addition to the 2011-12 data, with a 2012-13 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 73.2%, Missouri exceeded the target of 71.5%. Missouri also experienced an increase of over 2% in the five-year adjusted graduation rate moving from 74.7% to 76.8%.

#### **2012-13 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 Missouri transition 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
- Recruit, train and support local districts in the implementation of Check and Connect
- Certify RPDC consultants as Check and Connect trainers to provide training and technical assistance to LEAs
- Certify RPDC consultants for Train the Trainer for Dropout Prevention through the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities
- Promote use of Missouri Connections through dissemination of information via SELs and regional and statewide trainings, meetings and conferences

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities**

Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2011-12 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) 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 a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	4.8% dropout rate for students with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

For this APR, states were allowed the flexibility to report the dropout rate defined in the measurement table (see above) or report using the same data source and measurement that the state used for its previous APR. Missouri is reporting the dropout rate calculation used in the FFY2010 APR because this is the same calculation used for all students.

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%
2010-11	1,436	35,284	4.1%
2011-12	1,341	33,698	<b>4.0%</b>
2012-13	1,128	32,983	<b>3.4%</b>

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

A dropout is an individual who:

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

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

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

See Indicator 1 for Improvement Activities.

With a 4.0% dropout rate for 2011-12 and 3.4% for 2012-13, the state met the targets of 4.8% for both years and noted a continued decrease in the dropout rate from previous years moving from 4.9% in 2007-08 to 3.4% in 2012-13. Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2012-13 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) 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/AMO 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. AMO percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO 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 scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	A. Percent of districts meeting AMO: 37% B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA - 95% Math - 95% C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA - 57.9% Math - 58.6%

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

At 0.6%, the state did not meet the target for 3A Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) of 37%.

At 99.5% for communication arts (CA) and mathematics (Math), the state met the 2012-13 target of 95% for indicator 3B (participation).

At 25.8% for CA and 28.4% for Math, the state did not meet the targets for 3C (proficiency) of 57.9% for CA and 58.6% 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.

In June 2012, Missouri was notified that the ESEA Flexibility had been approved. Due to the approval, Missouri did not calculate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for districts or schools based on 2011-12 or 2012-13 data. Therefore, the data reported for Indicator 3A is based on AMO rather than AYP.

**Public Reporting Information: Mary is checking these websites. 11/8/13**

Public reports of assessment data are available online at

[mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx](http://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx) and  
[dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/Assessment.pdf](http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/Assessment.pdf)

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

The AMO proficiency goals for 2012-13 were 57.9% for communication arts and 58.6% for mathematics.

Districts Meeting AMO Targets in Disability Subgroup				
Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2011-12	Communication Arts	3	319	0.9%
	Mathematics	2	321	0.6%
	Combined – CA & Math	2	330	0.6%
2012-13	Communication Arts	2	311	0.6%
	Mathematics	4	313	1.3%
	Combined – CA & Math	2	317	<b>0.6%</b>

\* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for was 30

**B. Participation Rate for Children with IEPs WILL NEED TO CHECK AGAINST FEDERAL SUBMISSION PRIOR TO SENDING TO OSEP. 11/8/13**

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%
2011-12 Communication Arts	62,528	55,960	6,204	99.4%
2011-12 Mathematics	62,499	55,789	6,304	99.4%
<b>2012-13 Communication Arts</b>	<b>61,782</b>	<b>55,139</b>	<b>6,350</b>	<b>99.5%</b>
<b>2012-13 Mathematics</b>	<b>62,144</b>	<b>55,413</b>	<b>6,400</b>	<b>99.5%</b>

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

The number of students with disabilities tested differs in Communication Arts and Mathematics primarily due to testing at the high school level where End-of-Course exams and alternate assessments are administered at different courses and/or grade levels. Students are required to take End-of-Course exams for Algebra I and English II, so different students, and therefore different numbers of students are assessed in the two content areas. High School alternate assessments are administered for Mathematics at grade 10 and Communication Arts at grade 11. Small differences are also due to students who may have taken the assessment in one content area but were absent for the other content area.

**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.

**WILL NEED TO CHECK AGAINST FEDERAL SUBMISSION PRIOR TO SENDING TO OSEP. 11/8/13**

<b>MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities</b>			
	Total	Proficient or Advanced	Proficiency Rate
2011-12 Communication Arts Total	62,164	17,014	27.4%
2011-12 Mathematics Total	62,093	18,478	29.8%
2012-13 Communication Arts Total	61,489	15,859	<b>25.8%</b>
2012-13 Mathematics Total	61,813	17,581	<b>28.4%</b>

Source: State Assessment data

The number of students with disabilities tested differs in Communication Arts and Mathematics primarily due to testing at the high school level where End-of-Course exams and alternate assessments are administered at different courses and/or grade levels. Students are required to take End-of-Course exams for Algebra I and English II, so different students, and therefore different numbers of students are assessed in the two content areas. High School alternate assessments are administered for Mathematics at grade 10 and Communication Arts at grade 11. Small differences are also due to students who may have taken the assessment in one content area but were absent for the other content area.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

With the 2011-12 APR, Missouri changed from reporting on percent of districts meeting AYP to percent of districts meeting AMO's. This was due to the US Department of Education's approval of Missouri's ESEA Flexibility request. There were multiple ways to meet AYP (confidence intervals, safe harbor, growth, etc.), but AMO is determined solely by the percent of students meeting the proficiency target. The limitations of a single direct calculation and the terms of the flexibility request establishing the same level of proficiency for all students regardless of the existing proficiency gap significantly contributes to the difficulty districts face in trying to meet the AMO and for the state to meet the indicator. Missouri would appreciate OSEP allowing states to establish targets that are challenging but achievable for students with disabilities that are aligned with, but not identical to, the AMOs for all students.

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 2012-13 which are those established in Missouri's ESEA Flexibility request. The slippage seen in proficiency rates for students with disabilities mirrored slippage seen for all students.

**2012-13 Improvement Activities**

- Support the eMINTS TtS project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts.
- Develop and pilot an integrated tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students.
- Provide information to various stakeholders on tiered models of student support.

- Provide training/professional development to districts through the RPDC Consultants on tiered models of student support.
- 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 Tiered Support System:** See APR Overview under the category labeled “Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant].”

**Provide Information to Various Stakeholders on Tiered Models of Student Support.** See APR Overview under the categories labeled “Response to Intervention (RtI)”, “Missouri Integrated Model (MIM)”, and “Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).”

**Provide Training/Professional Development to Districts through the RPDC Consultants on Tiered models of student support):** See APR Overview under the categories labeled “Response to Intervention (RTI)”, “Missouri Integrated Model (MIM)”, and “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).”

**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 “RPDC 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.

**Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies:** See APR Overview under categories labeled “TheSource” and “RPDC Consultants.”

**Provide Training and Professional Development through the RPDC Consultants for Development and Implementation of Improvement Plans:** During the 2012-13 school year, Missouri began implementing a statewide collaborative improvement initiative intended to greatly improve student outcomes. This initiative will connect buildings/districts in each region of the state to share lessons, common formative assessments, effective teaching/learning practices and collaborative data practices to accelerate Missouri achievement for all students, but especially students with disabilities. Because the money used previously for Special Education Improvement Grants will now be used to support this initiative, the state will no longer issue Improvement Grants to districts. Therefore, districts will not be required to write and submit improvement plans for the purpose of grant application. District needs and areas of improvement will be addressed and monitored through the statewide collaborative improvement initiative.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) 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
2012-13	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 2012-13**

Per OSEP's instructions, 2011-12 data for 4A and 4B are being used for this APR.

For Indicator 4A, with 0.4% of 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 2010-11 and 2011-12.

For indicator 4B, one district in the state (0.2% of districts) was found to have policies, procedures or practices that contributed to significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity in suspension/expulsion rates; therefore, the state did not meet the established target of 0%.

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.

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

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4A:

For each district with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum “n” size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is 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)

A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0.

The following table outlines these factors:

<b>4A: Discipline Summary Based on 2011-12 Data</b>	
Total LEAs in state	568
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	58
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count (minimum “n” size of 10). Of the 502 excluded, 301 reported no long-term out-of-school removals.	510
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	10
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates*	8
Districts with second year of identification ( <b>significant discrepancy</b> )	2
<b>Percent of districts with significant discrepancies</b>	<b>0.4%</b>

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

\*“Not low discipline rates” indicates that students with disabilities had a discipline rate less than two incidents per hundred students and non-disabled students had a discipline rate less than one incident per hundred students. When computing a ratio from these low discipline rates, the results are often very skewed; however, the rates indicate that the districts are not excessively or routinely removing students from the classroom for discipline purposes.

#### INDICATOR 4B

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4B:

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

A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0.

The following table outlines these factors:

4B: Discipline Summary Based on 2011-12 Data					
	Black	White	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander
Total number of districts	568	568	568	568	568
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	28	32	0	0	0
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count	540 (of which 487 had no reported incidents)	536 (of which 336 had no reported incidents)	568 (of which 533 had no reported incidents)	568 (of which 544 had no reported incidents)	568 (of which 550 had no reported incidents)
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	9	1	0	0	0
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates*	9	1	0	0	0
(a) Districts with second year of identification ( <b>significant discrepancy</b> )	9	0	0	0	0
(b) Districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	1	0	0	0	0
<b>(b) as a percent of districts</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file

Unduplicated districts excluded from calculations: based on the table above a total of 48 districts met the minimum "n" size for one or more racial/ethnic categories. This resulted in 520 (568 – 48) unduplicated districts excluded from calculations.

\*"Not low discipline rates" indicates that students with disabilities had a discipline rate less than two incidents per hundred students and non-disabled students had a discipline rate less than one incident per hundred students. When computing a ratio from these low discipline rates, the results are often very skewed; however, the rates indicate that the districts are not excessively or routinely removing students from the classroom for discipline purposes.

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13

For the 2011-12 school year (based on 2010-11 and 2011-12 data), two districts (0.4% of districts) were identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A, resulting in the state meeting the Indicator 4A target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. For one of the districts, a comprehensive review was conducted which consisted of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data. In addition, a review of student files was

completed by the OSE in the area of discipline with a desk audit to verify results. For the second district, a modified review was conducted, consisting of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data.

The monitoring review of one district indicated that the discrepancy was not a result of inappropriate policies, but rather procedures or practices that did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards. Two findings were made related to inappropriate discipline procedures and practices. The OSE required the LEA to develop a Corrective Action Plan to include a review of procedures and practices. As a result of this review, the district provided documentation of its revised procedures and practices and training of staff on those revisions. The district also provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance allowed for by the IDEA. For the second district, the monitoring review indicated that the discrepancy was not a result of inappropriate policies, procedures or practices.

For Indicator 4B, the Department identified nine districts (based on data from 2010-11 and 2011-12) as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. Two of these nine districts received a comprehensive review which consisted of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data. In addition, a review of student files was completed by the OSE in the area of discipline with a desk audit to verify results. The remaining seven districts received a modified review consisting of a self-assessment and review of policies, procedures and practices by the identified district with phone monitoring for verification of data.

In one of the nine identified districts, reviews found that policies, procedures or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy and that district was not in compliance with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. In that district, corrective actions were ordered which required the district to correct all individual child noncompliance and to demonstrate that it is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements through submission of follow-up documentation. The OSE required the LEA to develop a Corrective Action Plan to include a review of procedures and practices. As a result of this review, the district provided documentation of its revised procedures and practices and training of staff on those revisions. The district also provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance allowed for by the IDEA. **Correction not completed, but due by January 29. This section will be completed when we have the data from this review.** In the remaining eight districts, there were no findings of noncompliance which contributed to the significant discrepancy.

### Correction of Previous Noncompliance

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance:** Based on a review of updated data submitted, the State verified that all findings of noncompliance identified in 2011-12 were corrected within twelve months as required by the IDEA and that the LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. For specific actions taken, see Overview under “Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators.”

**Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:** Using the original identification methodology for 4B, no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. However, in September 2011, OSEP notified the state that it must revise the identification methodology for 4B. Applying the revised methodology, the state identified ten districts and conducted reviews prior to the submission of the 2010-11 APR. Four districts were found to have noncompliance and corrected the noncompliance within twelve months.

**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.

**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 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

### 2012-13 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.

### 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 and implement an improvement plan and/or a corrective action plan.

**Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies:** See APR Overview under categories labeled “TheSource” 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 2012-13

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 or targets.

### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

4A: The State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2011 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

4B: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2012 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2011 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

### **DESE Response**

See Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance above.

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
2012-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class <math>\geq</math> 80% of the day: 59.5%</li> <li>B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class <math>&lt;</math> 40% of the day: 10.2%</li> <li>C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.5%</li> </ul>

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

At 58.1%, the target of 59.5% for Indicator 5A was not met. At 9.4% and 3.5%, the state met the targets of 10.2% and 3.5% for Indicator 5B and 5C, respectively.

Special Education Placement Data for ages 6–21						
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Inside Regular Class <math>\geq</math> 80% (5A)</b>	65,248	58.6%	64,212	58.9%	<b>62,504</b>	<b>58.1%</b>
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	28,601	25.7%	27,978	25.6%	28,335	26.3%
<b>Inside Regular Class <math>&lt;</math> 40% (5B)</b>	10,384	9.3%	10,219	9.4%	<b>10,145</b>	<b>9.4%</b>
Separate School	3,258	2.9%	3,189	2.9%	3,110	2.9%
Homebound/Hospital	715	0.6%	698	0.6%	680	0.6%
Residential Facility	4	0.0%	7	0.0%	6	0.0%
<b>Total Separate (5C)</b>	3,977	3.6%	3,894	3.6%	<b>3,796</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
Correctional Facilities	917	0.8%	832	0.8%	762	0.7%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,146	1.9%	1,956	1.8%	2,073	1.9%
<b>Total School Age</b>	<b>111,273</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>109,091</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>107,615</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

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 2012-13**

With 58.1%, the state did not meet the target of 59.5% for Inside Regular Class  $\geq$  80% (5A). With 9.4%, the state met the target of 10.2% for Inside Regular Class  $<$  40% (5B). At 3.5%, the state met the target of 3.5% for Separate Settings (5C). While the target for 5A was not met, the data indicates progress from the previous year for 5A. 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 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.

### 2012-13 Improvement Activities

- Support the use of tiered models of support 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, tiered models of support 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 Tiered Models of Support and Inclusive Instructional Practices:** The Office of Special Education has numerous activities which focus on support for districts to use tiered models of support. Those activities are:

Co-teaching: See next section below.

Collaborative Work: See Overview under category labeled "Collaborative Work".

SW-PBIS: See Overview under category labeled "Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).

**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 about 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 tiered models of support. See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention. During the 2012-13 school year, RPDC consultants held 29 co-teaching trainings and 25 differentiated instruction trainings across the state; there were 469 and 676 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

**Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies:** See APR Overview under categories labeled "TheSource" and "RPDC Consultants." The Office of Special Education collaborated

with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two-part RTI overview. The overview is available at [dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars\\_presentations.html](http://dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars_presentations.html).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

DRAFT

**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
2012-2013	A: At least 47.3% of children aged 3-5 with IEPs attend a regular early childhood program and receive the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program  B: At most 22.8% of children aged 3-5 with IEPs attend a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

Two sets of data are included below for this indicator. The first includes all children ages 3-5 and matches the federal data reporting requirements. The established targets are based on these data. The second data table includes only children in early childhood programs, thereby excluding five-year old kindergarten students. This second set of data is most representative of early childhood special education in Missouri. Including all five-year olds, which encompasses a large number of five-year old children in kindergarten, artificially inflates the percentage for 6A and decreases the percentage in 6B, since most kindergarteners receiving special education services are in a regular classroom.

Using data from the first chart which matches federal data reporting requirements, at 47.2% and 22.9%, the state did not meet the target for 6A or 6B, but was within a tenth of a percent of meeting both targets.

Educational Environments Ages 3-5 (Includes 5K Children)						
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Regular program 10+ hours, majority of services in regular program*	6,739	42.4%	6,961	43.5%	7,037	43.9%
Regular program <10 hours, majority of services in regular program*	630	4.0%	590	3.7%	529	3.3%
<b>6A: Majority of Services in Regular Program</b>		<b>46.4%</b>		<b>47.2%</b>		<b>47.2%</b>
Regular program 10+ hours, majority of services in other location	2,834	17.8%	2,662	16.7%	2,806	17.5%
Regular program <10 hours, majority of services in other location	681	4.3%	693	4.3%	641	4.0%
Separate Class**	3,443	21.7%	3,439	21.5%	3,446	21.5%
Separate School**	240	1.5%	229	1.4%	232	1.4%
Residential Facility**	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>6B: Special Education Program</b>		<b>23.2%</b>		<b>22.9%</b>		<b>22.9%</b>
Home	130	0.8%	130	0.8%	119	0.7%
Service Provider Location	1,194	7.5%	1,280	8.0%	1,230	7.7%
Total	15,891	100.0%	15,984	100.0%	1,6040	100.0%

\* Included in 6A: Majority of Services in Regular Program

\*\* Included in 6B: Special Education Program

Educational Environments Ages 3-5 (Includes only PK children)						
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Regular program 10+ hours, majority of services in regular program*	2,810	24.5%	2,809	24.6%	2,870	25.3%
Regular program <10 hours, majority of services in regular program*	630	5.5%	590	5.2%	536	4.7%
<b>6A: Majority of Services in Regular Program</b>		<b>29.9%</b>		<b>29.7%</b>		<b>30.0%</b>
Regular program 10+ hours, majority of services in other location	2,415	21.0%	2,314	20.2%	2,413	21.3%
Regular program <10 hours, majority of services in other location	679	5.9%	695	6.1%	640	5.6%
Separate Class**	3,443	30.0%	3,441	30.1%	3,405	30.0%
Separate School**	186	1.6%	181	1.6%	166	1.5%
Residential Facility**	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>6B: Special Education Program</b>		<b>31.6%</b>		<b>31.7%</b>		<b>31.5%</b>
Home	127	1.1%	125	1.1%	114	1.0%
Service Provider Location	1,197	10.4%	1,277	11.2%	1,209	10.7%
Total	11,487	100.0%	11,432	100.0%	11,353	100.0%

\* Included in 6A: Majority of Services in Regular Program

\*\* Included in 6B: Special Education Program

## Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13

As stated above, two sets of data are included above. The first includes all children ages 3-5 and matches the federal data reporting requirements. The established targets are based on these data. The second data table includes only children in early childhood programs, thereby excluding five-year old kindergarten students. This second set of data is most representative of early childhood special education in Missouri. Including all five-year olds, which encompasses a large number of five-year old children in kindergarten, artificially inflates the percentage for 6A and decreases the percentage in 6B, since most kindergarteners receiving special education services are in a regular classroom.

Using data from the first chart, which matches federal data reporting requirements, at 47.2% and 22.9%, while the state did not meet the target for 6A or 6B, it was within a tenth of a percent of meeting both targets. When looking at the second set of data, which more closely represents the children receiving services in ECSE in Missouri, the percentage for 6A (30.0%) is significantly below the established target. Likewise, for 6B, the percentage in the second chart (31.5%) is significantly above the target of 22.8%. In order to make informed decisions about improvement for this indicator, both sets of data are used and analyzed.

### 2012-13 Improvement Activities

- Support the use of tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices for Early Childhood Special Education.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for Early Childhood Special Education to promote placement with nondisabled peers.
- 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 tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices for Early Childhood Special Education:** This improvement activity was not addressed for the 2012-13 school year. It will begin during the 2013-14 school year.

**Provide training and professional development through the RPDC consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for Early Childhood Special Education to promote placement with nondisabled peers:** This improvement activity was not addressed for the 2012-13 school year. It will begin during the 2013-14 school year.

**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:** See APR 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 based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator:** 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.

**Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator:** See APR Overview under categories labeled "TheSource" and "RPDC Consultants."

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

DRAFT

<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>
---

**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:**

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			
	2012-13	Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills
Summary Statement 1		92.7%	93.8%	90.7%
Summary Statement 2		55.6%	42.4%	60.7%

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

2012-13 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	44	1.0%	43	1.0%	47	1.1%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable	157	3.6%	94	2.1%	150	3.4%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	1,951	44.1%	2,370	53.6%	1,595	36.1%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable	1,263	28.6%	1,470	33.3%	1,464	33.1%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable	1,005	22.7%	443	10.0%	1,164	26.3%
Total	4,420	100.0%	4,420	100.0%	4,420	100.0%

2012-13 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	94.1%	96.6%	93.9%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited.	51.3%	43.3%	59.5%

**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](http://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 of 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](http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html) and in the SPP.

The State of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June of 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, ECSE staff are being trained in the administration of this assessment and may begin using the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

At 94.1%, 96.6% and 93.9%, Missouri met all three targets for Summary Statement One for outcomes A (92.7%), B (93.8%) and C (90.7%). At 51.3%, 43.3% and 59.5%, Missouri did not meet the targets for Summary Statement Two for outcomes A (55.6%) or C (60.7%), but did meet the target for outcome B (42.4%). Percentages for Summary Statement One remained high, and percentages for Summary Statement Two all showed little change from the previous year.

In reviewing data for the Missouri Part C Indicator 3, Missouri Part C 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. Children who enter First Steps below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exited as reflected in Summary Statement 1; however, children are not necessarily functioning at age expectation by the time they exited as reflected in Summary Statement 2. This trend is indicative of the State's eligibility criteria, since Missouri has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age developmental delay and does not serve at-risk children.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children 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 often not exiting Part B performing at age expectations.

#### **2012-13 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.
- Based on the outcome of a statewide pilot identify a common assessment tool and develop a plan for implementation.

### Improvement Activity Discussion

**Provide ECO Training:** Most ECO training materials, including handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>. In 2010-11, a video presentation was made available as an online module in order to record the type and number of participants accessing the video training. In 2010-11, there were 21 registrants from higher education, early intervention and other professionals who completed the online module. In 2011-12, the number of registrants increased to 24 from public schools, higher education, early intervention and other professionals who completed the online module. Though the number of registrants increased slightly it is still a very low representation of professionals working in the First Steps and ECSE programs. However, as indicated above, all other training materials are available on the DESE website. Data show there were 3,432 hits on this site in the past 12 months. The state is considering revisions to the training materials and marketing strategies to increase participants using the video presentation for 2012-13.

ECSE and First Steps personnel receive regular reminders through listserv messages 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.

**Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO Data through MOSIS annually:** The state encourages ECSE and First Steps personnel to collaborate in the assignment of the First Steps exit ratings and ECSE entry ratings.

In previous years, State staff found First Steps personnel were reporting data primarily via parent input while ECSE personnel were reporting data primarily via assessment results. The State then modified the data collection procedures for ECO so all First Steps and ECSE ratings must include three sources of information: parent input, professional observation and assessment results. The State encourages First Steps and ECSE personnel to collaborate in the assignment of a First Steps exit rating in order for the ECSE entry rating to be the same.

For the past three years, state staff has performed cross checks of First Steps exit and ECSE entry ratings. The trend analysis indicates that the match rate has remained at approximately 30-35% of children having matching entry/exit ratings; however, data also shows that the match rate varies across regions in the state. Cross checks in 2012-13 revealed that matching First Steps exit and ECSE entry ratings remained at approximately 30% of children. Additional analysis shows that 30% of FS exit/ECSE entry ratings were within 1 point of matching.

**Provide Targeted Technical Assistance:** The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC directors and consultants on a regular basis. ECO data are 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 "TheSource."

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

**OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 with the FFY 2012 APR.

**DESE Response**

The state has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 with this APR.

DRAFT

**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
2012-13	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 2012-13**

At 77.6% 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 2012-13 school year.

For the 2012-13 school year, the OSE worked with the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) at the University of Missouri to develop and disseminate a Parent Survey (see below).

**Survey Instrument**

The 2013 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 192 school districts that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes. The districts were instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of students with disabilities. Parents could respond online or could request and complete a paper form. All surveys were due back by June 1st, 2013. The following questions were listed as part of the survey:

1. My child's school offers parents training about special education issues
2. Teachers/professionals at school informed me about disability support organizations
3. School provides information on agencies that can assist my child with school to work/career transition
4. School explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school
5. Teachers/professionals have asked my opinion about how special education services meet my child's needs
6. Teachers/administrators encourage me to participate in the decision making process
7. Teachers/professionals at school communicate with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals
8. I am considered an equal partner with teachers/professionals in planning my child's program
9. My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement
10. My child's school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both questions 9 and 10, 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 of Parent Survey**

Parents of Students with Disabilities	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2012-13	3,486 (77.6%)	1,009 (22.4%)	4,495 (100.0%)
2011-12	2,503 (77.8%)	715 (22.2%)	3,218 (100.0%)
2010-11	5,664 (71.4%)	2,270 (28.6%)	7,934 (100.0%)
2009-10	4,565 (69.3%)	2,027 (30.7%)	6,592 (100.0%)
2008-09	5,103 (69.6%)	2,234 (30.4%)	7,337 (100.0%)
2007-08	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006-07	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

The 2013 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 192 school districts that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes. The districts were instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of students with disabilities. Parents could respond online or could request and complete a paper form. All surveys were due back by May 29, 2013. A total of 4,495 were completed, 2,896 by mail and 1,599 electronically. The two lowest rated statements were "My child's school offered parents training about special education issues" and "School provides information on agencies that can assist my child with school to work/career transition." Both had average responses of 3.32. The highest rated statement was "My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement." The range of responses on the 10 statements was 3.32 to 4.31.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

With an agreement rate of 77.6%, the state did not meet the target of 80.0% established for the 2012-13 school year; however, due to the process of using monitoring cohorts of districts for data collection, it is difficult to analyze progress or slippage and any effects from the implementation of Improvement Activities.

**2012-13 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 Assistance (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 return rate for the 2012-13 data was 10.1%. This rate of return was attributed to several factors: (1) the timing of the distribution of the survey, (2) the process of distribution of the survey, and (3) marketing of the survey to both districts and parents. The survey distribution will begin earlier for 2013-14 allowing more time for completion. In addition, the introductory letter and the survey will be delivered to the district at the same time which should make the process more efficient. It is believed these changes will help to increase the rate of return for the surveys.

**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 125 updates made to the MPACT website during July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Many of the updates contained multiple links and changes to multiple resources. These included updating and re-uploading all fact sheets, sample forms and letters (145), updating of training calendar, splash pages, update or add new state resource links, researched and corrected broken links, updates to Community Resource Database and mentor trainings. These updates also included the archiving of the e-newsletter and mentor training. The website received 37,236 visitors during this reporting period with 1,685 visits to the Mentor Portal. 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 tiered model portion of the website received 2,738 page views. There were 239 online transition trainings accessed during the 2012-13 schools year in the areas of Connecting Goals to Coordinated Activities, IDEA Transition Requirements, Soft Skills, Solving the Employment Puzzle, Disability Disclosure, and Transition to Postsecondary Experiences. Face-to-face training held during the 2012-13 school year included self-determination, student-led IEPs and solving the employment puzzle (274 students, 8 self-advocates); transition summit (99 students); post-secondary schooling (26 students); student-led IEPs (27 students); soft skills (32 students); self-determination (34 students) and life after graduation/employment (30 students); and in-school training thru MPACT Regional Transition Networks on career development, employment rights, and self-determination (116 students).

**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 2012-13 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 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 2012-13 school year. There were four participants who attended training for "Writing Post Secondary

Goals for Students with ASD." In 2012-2013 MPACT also presented "Understanding the IEP Process for Parents of Children with ASD" to 94 participants.

**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 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 October 5, 2012. There were 50 recipients of scholarships awards from 48 districts. Awards were made on a first come, first serve basis with preference given to first-time applicants.

Training was delivered to these educators by Parents as Teachers National trainers each of whom has personal and professional experience in special education. A follow up survey was sent to those who attended training. Of the twenty-five respondents, 92% agreed the professional development supported their work with children and families and indicated they had shared this information with the families served. In addition 96% shared information with coworkers, 80% of the respondents had an understanding of how to make referrals to appropriate community resources and 86% utilized information in the training guide to promote positive strategies and adapt activities when working with families. The respondents also indicated after training they referred to the Special Needs Guide as follows: 64% used the guide one to five times, 24% five to ten times, and 0% more than ten times. The National Early Intervention Guide or State Resource pages were accessed one to five times by 44% of the respondents, and the handouts were utilized one to ten or more times by 64%.

**Provide Targeted Technical Assistance:** District-level data on survey results compared to the SPP target was provided to the Regional Professional Development consultants in the fall of 2012.

**Provide Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR Overview under the category labeled "TheSource." TheSource website provides information on evidence-based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

**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 2011-12 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 of Success (see [dese.mo.gov/se/se-ep-parentinvolvement.htm](http://dese.mo.gov/se/se-ep-parentinvolvement.htm)). 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. Models of success were not solicited during the 2012-13 school year due to the reconstruction of the selection rubric.

**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 was developed and disseminated to the RPDC consultants in the 2012-13 school year. Two parent involvement trainings were presented as a part of the 2013 dropout prevention summit. Each presentation concerned an aspect of cultural competency and parental involvement. There were approximately 85 school personnel present for the training.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

DRAFT

**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 2011, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified 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 2011 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2012. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	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 2012-13**

The state met the 2012-13 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 overrepresentation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"	
Risk Ratio	Cell size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 in racial/ethnic group</li> <li>AND</li> <li>At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)</li> </ul>

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: 76
- Hispanic: 48
- Asian: 15
- Native American: 4
- Pacific Islander: 0
- Multi-racial: 28

A total of 121 districts had the minimum “n” size for one or more racial/ethnic groups. This resulted in 442 (563 – 121) 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 with overrepresentation. 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.

2012-13 Indicator 9 Identification Data		
Year	Number of LEAs meeting overrepresentation criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2012-13 identification using data from 2011-12 & 2012-13	0	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.

As indicated in the table above, in 2012-13 no LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2011-12 and 2012-13, 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 were the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation.

#### Correction of Previous Noncompliance

##### Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance

There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2011-12; therefore no correction was required.

##### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2010-11; therefore no correction was required.

##### 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.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

The state met the 2012-13 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.

**2012-13 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**

Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2012-13 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) 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 2012, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified 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 2012, i.e., after June 30, 2013. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	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 2012-13**

The state met the 2012-13 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. **This can't be finalized until the reviews are completed. Anticipate by mid-January.**

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	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group AND At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all 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	55	42	22	1	0	0	4	56	507
Autism	23	13	2	2	0	0	1	24	539
Sp/Lang	52	34	19	3	0	0	4	52	511
ED	22	18	1	0	0	0	1	24	539
ID	26	23	4	1	0	0	1	29	534
OHI	38	31	4	1	0	0	4	38	525

Based on the table above, 72 districts were evaluated for one or more disability and race/ethnicity combinations. This results in 491 (563–72) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for 2012-13 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified 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.

2012-13 Indicator 10 Identification Data		
Year	Number of districts meeting overrepresentation criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of districts with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2012-13 identification using data from 2011-12 & 2012-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• ED: 0 in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• ID: 5 LEAs with overrepresentation of black students</li> <li>• OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity category</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLD: 0</li> <li>• Autism: 0</li> <li>• Sp/Lang: 0</li> <li>• ED: 0</li> <li>• ID: 0</li> <li>• OHI: 0</li> </ul>

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

As indicated in the table above, for 2012-13, five districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2011-12 and 2012-13. All five were identified in the area of overrepresentation of black students with Intellectual Disability.

Will finalize after reviews completed – anticipate mid-January... Monitoring reviews of the five districts with overrepresentation of black students with intellectual disabilities indicated that ...

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

#### Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance

No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2011-12, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

#### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2010-11, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

**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 2012-13**

Pending finalization of reviews... The state met the 2012-13 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 the list of improvement activities for this indicator

**Discussion of Improvement Activities**

**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 2013, Special Education Administrators Conference held in September 2013, monthly webinars, and Special Education monitoring training held in October and November 2013. 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 is available at [nccrest.org/publications/tools/assessment.html](http://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/](http://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 "TheSource."

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

DRAFT

**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
2012-13	100% of children will be evaluated within 60-days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 97.6% of the time. The State of Missouri has established a state timeline of 60 days 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](http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf)) include the following language regarding initial evaluation timelines:

*Evaluation Timelines*

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

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

*Initial Evaluation (34 CFR 300.301)*

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

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

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

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

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

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60-days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in 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 (per State Regulation)
- Agency vacation days (per State Regulation)
- Child's absence because of illness (per State Regulation)
- Summer break (per State Regulation)
- 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 2012-13					
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
2012-13 Total	7,024 (a)	6,259	599	6,858 (b)	97.6%
Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 192 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2012-13. A total of 185 of the 192 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.					

Calculation =  $(b / a) \times 100$  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.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend							
Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.0%	97.1%	97.8%	96.8%	97.8%	97.9%	<b>97.6%</b>

The number of days past the 60-day timeline ranged from one day to 115 days, with over 78% of the delays due to acceptable reasons. One district reported a 115 day delay due to a waiting on additional information from an independent evaluation. This was not acceptable. The district completed a corrective action which included training and submission of additional documentation of meeting initial timelines. Approximately 82% of the delays were 20 days or less with 58% of the delays ten days or less and 37% 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 demonstrate compliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

### Correction of Previous Noncompliance

#### Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance

The state verified 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 through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional timeline data for initial evaluations in IMACS (Prong 1). 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 (Prong 2).

#### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

The state verified 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 through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional timeline data for initial evaluations in IMACS (Prong 1). 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 (Prong 2).

#### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

#### Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

#### Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13

At 97.6%, the state is not meeting the target of 100%, but is continuing to address this indicator at a high rate of compliance. The 97.6% rate is a slight decrease 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.

### 2012-13 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:** Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) special education compliance consultants worked with Office of Special Education compliance supervisors to target the districts needing assistance in meeting the 60-day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts that 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 Tiered Monitoring 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.

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 Directors' Training.

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

**Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies:** See APR Overview under the category labeled "TheSource."

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

### MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table

#### OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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) 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**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 onsite 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).

**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 or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR 300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under 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
2012-13	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 2012-13**

With 93.9% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2012-13, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%.

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 part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three-year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

Data for 2012-13 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
- Student eligible? (Y/N)
- 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. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

Part C to Part B Referrals	
	2012-13
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination	528
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday (includes 2 children determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined after the third birthday)	77
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	388
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR 300.301(d) applied	32
e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	6
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday (# in a, but not b, c, d, or e)	25
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)	<b>93.9%</b>

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 192 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2012-13. A total of 93 of the 192 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Percent within Acceptable Timelines Trend							
Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
%	80.3%	88.6%	91.3%	95.0%	96.6%	95.5%	<b>93.9%</b>

Of the 25 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, all but four had their IEPs in place within one month of turning three. Two more children had their IEPs in place within two months of the third birthday. The longest delays of 81 and 93 days after the third birthday were partly due to parent delays.

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 2011 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 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

#### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

#### Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

**Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)**

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

There was slight slippage from the prior year at 95.5% to this reporting period at 93.9%. An analysis of data showed that the noncompliance was comprised of 25 children in 12 districts across the state. The OSE does not believe this slippage is significant given the distribution across districts and the state as a whole and the overall high level of compliance maintained.

**2012-13 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 that need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notify RPDC compliance consultants of districts that 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 tiered monitoring review year. In this training, emphasis is placed upon public agency's 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 Directors' 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://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/Transitionindexpg.htm>. Part C and Part B hold joint trainings for individual System Point of Entry (SPOE) regions and local school district early childhood special education (ECSE) staff throughout the year to supplement online materials that include technical assistance documents and training modules. In October 2012 and March 2013, Part C to B Transition webinars were conducted to again inform the field about the requirements and timelines for both Part C and Part B. In January and April 2013, Part C staff presented the First Steps requirements to the ECSE Coalition Meeting of ECSE directors and First Steps providers in the state. Finally, in 2012-13, listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year.

The Department has developed a family information packet on Part C to Part B transition which 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 as well as 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 available to ECSE program staff as a resource. Some regions hold joint Part C and Part B meetings between SPOE staff and local ECSE staff to discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between the two programs to facilitate successful transitions for families.

**Evidence-Based Practices and Strategies:** See APR Overview under category labeled “TheSource.”

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

**OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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) 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**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.

<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition</b>
---

**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))

<b>Measurement:</b> 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
2012-13	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals

### Actual Target Data for 2012-13

With a compliance rate of 87.5%, the state did not meet the 100% target for 2012-13, but did show continued progress from the previous year.

Indicator 13 Actual Target Data			
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%
2011-12	793	653	82.3%
2012-13	850	744	<b>87.5%</b>

### Correction of Previous Noncompliance

**Correction of FFY 2011 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.

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

## Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13

Actual target data shows an increase in compliance from 2010-11 (79.4%) to 2011-12 (82.3%) to 2012-13 (87.5%). 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 the compliance percentage until all districts could be retrained on the new criteria. A training plan was developed and is being implemented. As evidenced by the steady increase in compliance, the state believes that continued training and technical assistance for districts will result in improved outcomes and continued movement toward the goal of 100% compliance with this indicator.

### 2012-13 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 (TOP) to all districts in order to have districts at 100% compliance on Indicator 13.

### Improvement Activity Discussion

**Provide Professional Development and Training:** The Office of Special Education (OSE) contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary to create an evidence-based practice piece to follow TOP 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 was completed during the 2011-12 school year.

RPDC improvement consultants who deal with post secondary education received Train-the-Trainer instruction on the evidence-based practice website in June 2012. Initial training for schools was scheduled to begin in the 2012-13 school year, however, due to data linkage issues, the site was not actively used until the 2013-14 school year.

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

**Provide Information on Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR Overview under category labeled “TheSource.”

**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.

**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, 2012, through June 30, 2013, the main page of Models of Success was viewed 2,446 times by 1,743 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 MO CoP and emails with information and the application were sent on SELS and the MO CoP. The online submission form was available on [transitioncoalition.org](http://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, the results of the review process and the programs/practices that were recommended for development online were provided to the Department for final approval.
- Development: Transition Coalition staff worked with Models of Success to finalize descriptions and materials for posting to Models of Success page of [transitioncoalition.org](http://transitioncoalition.org). Transition Coalition staff followed up with contacts for each Model of Success annually to update their information and to ensure it was still in place.
- Dissemination: Identified Models of Success were highlighted at appropriate face-to-face trainings, conferences and online events in Missouri. RPDC consultants and transition liaisons were informed of the Models of Success 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](http://missouritransition.org).

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

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

#### **OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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) 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**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 § 300.320(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) 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.

DRAFT

<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition</b>
---

**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
2012-13	A: 24.4%    B: 46.9%    C: 51.3%

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

Graduate and Dropout Follow-up Data						
2012-13 Follow-up Data	2011-12 Graduates		2011-12 Dropouts		2011-12 Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) 4-Year College	559	8.7%	4	0.3%	563	7.4%
(2) 2-Year College	1,653	25.6%	8	0.7%	1,661	21.8%
(3) Non-College	191	3.0%	10	0.9%	201	2.6%
(4) Competitive Employment	1,623	25.1%	67	5.8%	1,690	22.2%
(5) Noncompetitive Employment	113	1.7%	5	0.4%	118	1.5%
(6) Military	165	2.6%	0	0.0%	165	2.2%
(7) Continuing Education – did not complete one term	316	4.9%	7	0.6%	323	4.2%
(8) Employed – less than 20 hours/week or 90 days	364	5.6%	17	1.5%	381	5.0%
(9) Other	931	14.4%	205	17.6%	1,136	14.9%
(10) Unknown	545	8.4%	839	72.2%	1,384	18.2%
Total Follow-up	6,460	100.0%	1,162	100.0%	7,622	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)]	2,224	29.2%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education) [(4) + (6)]	1,855	24.3%
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)]	201	2.6%
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)]	118	1.5%
Other categories [(7) + (8) + (9) + (10)]	3,224	42.3%
<b>Total Graduates and Dropouts</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Summary Measures	Number	Percent
<b>A:</b> Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)]	2,224	<b>29.2%</b>
<b>B:</b> Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)]	4,079	<b>53.5%</b>
<b>C:</b> 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)]	4,398	<b>57.7%</b>
<b>Total Graduates and Dropouts</b>	<b>7,622</b>	

Summary Measures Trend (Follow-up on Previous Year's Exitters)	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>A:</b> Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)]	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
<b>B:</b> Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)]	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>53.5%</b>
<b>C:</b> 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)]	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>

Follow-up data are collected on all students with disabilities who graduated or dropped out from grades 9-12 during the previous school year. The data collection is an annual, census collection for all school districts in the state with a 100% response rate.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13

At 29.2%, 53.5% and 57.7%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statements A (24.4%), B (46.9%) and C (51.3%) respectively.

#### 2012-13 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.
- 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.

### **Improvement Activity Discussion**

Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2012-13 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**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
2012-13	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

At 99.8%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for correction of noncompliance within 12 months. The noncompliance that was not timely corrected was attributable to one district with a total of five compliance indicators that were not corrected within 12 months from notification. A total of 107 responsible public agencies including public charter schools had monitoring reports issued during 2011-12. This was the last cohort included in the Special Education monitoring process that followed the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district was reviewed once within the five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled "Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (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 2011-12: the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2011-12
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2011-12: 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 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	20	24	24
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.  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.		0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities:	55	263	263
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution:	12	19	19
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.	Monitoring Activities:	2	2	2
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.	Dispute Resolution:	3	3	3
	Monitoring Activities:	67	225	225
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities:	91	950	949
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Dispute Resolution:	7	9	9
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.  10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution:	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:	82	383	380
	Dispute Resolution:	5	7	7
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities:	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	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:	65	189	188
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			2,076	2,071
<b>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100</b>			<b>(b) / (a) X 100 =</b>	<b>99.8%</b>

**Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (either timely or subsequent):**

Missouri had 99.8% of the findings of noncompliance identified in 2011-12 timely corrected and verified within one year of notification, including correction of all individual noncompliance. This represents one school district in the state that did not show evidence of timely correction of noncompliance. However, with increased technical assistance, subsequent correction on noncompliance was achieved within 15 months of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition, 100% of noncompliance identified through child complaints and due process was corrected within 12 months of the decision.

The state verified that the one district with identified noncompliance that was not corrected within 12 months was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional data to demonstrate compliance (Prong 1). 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 (Prong 2).

The Department has strong procedures to ensure that districts submit all documentation of correction of noncompliance 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, emails and letters districts are reminded often of the requirement for correction of all noncompliance within the 12-month timeframe and the consequences for failing to meet that timeline. Districts indicating an inability or unwillingness to correct noncompliance also receive hands-on technical assistance provided by compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants.

The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all but one district 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. These follow-up procedures were used to verify subsequent correction of all identified noncompliance was achieved in the one district within 15 months of the identification of noncompliance.

### **Correction of Previous Noncompliance**

#### **Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):**

N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

#### **Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):**

N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

Missouri did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator, but continues to maintain a very high percent of compliance.

#### **2012-13 Improvement Activities**

- 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:**

See APR overview "Federal Tiered Monitoring Three Year Cohort Cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators."

##### **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 noncompliance 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 noncompliance. 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 noncompliance. 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 provide targeted technical assistance.

In the Federal Tiered Monitoring training and other statewide conferences such as the Special Education Administrators' Conference emphasis is placed upon state targets to ensure districts that are preparing for their Federal Tiered Monitoring review understand the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Federal Tiered Monitoring training maintains its focus upon the importance of correction of noncompliance.

The Department has six 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 noncompliance are provided to RPDC compliance consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. Regular trainings are held with both the compliance supervisors and the compliance consultants to insure consistent information and guidance for compliance issues are provided across regions of the state. 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 noncompliance. 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 regular 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 noncompliance.

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 noncompliance in 12 months. This diligence has resulted in an extremely high level of correction of noncompliance within 12 months in our state.

The compliance supervisors generate regular data reports to track correction of noncompliance. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months such as phone calls, emails, 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 noncompliance 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 "TheSource."

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

## **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

### **OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2001: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2012 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.

Correction of noncompliance for Indicators 4B, 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.

DRAFT

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

**Indicator 16:** Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR for the February 2013 and all subsequent submissions.

DRAFT

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

**Indicator 17:** Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR for the February 2013 and all subsequent submissions.

DRAFT

**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
2012-13	35.3% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

At 32.4% of resolution sessions resulting in settlement agreements, Missouri did not meet the target of 35.3% established for the 2012-13 school year.

Resolution Session and Settlement Agreement Trend Data								
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41	25	29	51	34	34
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20	11	16	10	15	11
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	48.8%	44.0%	55.2%	19.6%	44.1%	<b>32.4%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

The data for 2012-13 shows a decrease in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements from the previous year. 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. Pam needs to get with Wanda or Dana to get this data.

**2012-13 Improvement Activities**

- Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection.
- Develop and disseminate information on the Missouri IDEA complaint system through a variety of methods to parents, school staff, advocates and other interested parties.

**Improvement Activity Discussion**

**Collect Information Regarding Resolution Session Outcomes to Improve Data Collection:** During 2011-12 procedures were developed and implemented to track and follow-up on resolution session timelines and outcomes. SEA staff is 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.

**Develop and Disseminate Information on Complaint System:** 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. Addendums to the Parent's Guide to Special Education were

completed in June 2010 and September 2012 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 19,388 copies were mailed during 2012-13. 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.

All MPACT staff and mentors are vested in supporting parents in the lowest level of resolution appropriate when parents present special education process issues as their need for assistance. In 2012-13, 1,884 dispute resolution materials were disseminated and MPACT dispute resolution trainings were attended by 392 participants. In 2012-13 one-on-one assistance data collection indicated that the following actions were taken or intended to be taken by parents:

- Letter of understanding (1,684)
- Request for Notice of Action (646)
- Request for mediation (58)
- Request for resolution conference (12)
- Contact DESE compliance (96)
- Contact LEA Special Education Director (808)
- Request an evaluation meeting (102)
- Schedule meetings with school administration (176).

The Office of Special Education uses its Special Education Listservs (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 and the Procedural Safeguards.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

**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
2012-13	35.3% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

Missouri met the 2012-13 target with 94.3% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

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%
2011-12	18	25	72.0%
2012-13	33	35	<b>94.3%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12**

With 94.3% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.3% for 2011-12.

**2012-13 Improvement Activities**

- Develop and disseminate information on the Missouri IDEA complaint system through a variety of methods to parents, school staff, advocates and other interested parties.

**Improvement Activity Discussion**

Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2012-13 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

**MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

DRAFT

<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision</b>
--

**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, State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment ; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

**Actual Target Data for 2012-13**

Missouri continues to report all data, including 618 data and SPP/APRs in a timely and accurate fashion.

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:** The Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) is the Department's student-level collection system. The student-level data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, educational environment, 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 ESEA 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 Initial Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Transition Planning (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15). IMACS is also used to conduct discipline (APR 4) and 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 collection for Parent Involvement (APR 8) is described in that indicator.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed / Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13**

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2012-13.

The Department utilizes a variety of data verification methodologies:

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the 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 for all districts. Throughout 2012-13, 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 based on district performance data.
- Data gathered through IMACS 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.

#### **2012-13 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, Rtl and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)).

#### **Improvement Activity Discussion**

Per OSEP instructions, as the State met its 2012-13 target for this indicator, a discussion of improvement activities is not included.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13**

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 or targets.

#### **MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.