

## 2012-13 Part B SPP/APR Summary

11/29/2012

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
1-Graduation Rates	2011-12: 70.0% 2012-2013: 71.5%	Four-year cohort-- 2011-12: 72..8% 2012-2013: 73.2%  Adjusted five-year cohort: 2010-2011: 74.7% 2011-2012: 76.8%	2011-12: MET 2012-2013: MET	The graduation rate data reported 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.	Indicator MET. Per OSEP instructions we do not have to report on progress/slippage or Improvement Activities.  No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.  ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP:  None
2-Dropout Rates	2011-12: 4.8% 2012-13: 4.8%	2011-12: 4.0% 2012-13: 3.4%	2011-12: MET	Per instructions for the APR, 2011-12 data is reported for this 2012-13 APR, however Missouri has opted to include data for 2012-13 as well. 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 previous APR because this is the same calculation used for all students.	Indicator MET. Per OSEP instructions we do not have to report on progress/slippage or Improvement Activities.  No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.  ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP:  None
3 – MAP	A. Percent of districts meeting	A: 0.6%	A. NOT MET	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	AYP has been changed to AMO. AMO has no safe harbor, confidence interval or

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
	<p>AMO:37%</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA-95% Math-95%</p> <p>C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 57.9% Math – 58.6%</p>	<p>B: 99.5% (CA) 99.5% (Math)</p> <p>C: 25.8% (CA) 28.4% (Math)</p>	<p>B. MET</p> <p>C. NOT MET</p>	<p>based on 2011-12 or 2012-13 data. Therefore, the data reported for Indicator 3A is based on AMO rather than AYP.</p>	<p>growth.</p> <p>The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities.</p> <p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None</p>
4A – Discipline	≤0.5% of districts will have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates	0.4%	MET		<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None</p>
4B—Discipline	0.0%	0.2%	NOT MET		<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
5 – LRE	<p>A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class <math>\geq</math> 80% of the day: <math>\geq</math>59.5%</p> <p>B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class <math>&lt;</math> 40% of the day: <math>\leq</math>10.2%</p> <p>C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: <math>\leq</math>3.5%</p>	<p>A. 58.1%</p> <p>B. 9.4%</p> <p>C. 3.5%</p>	<p>A. NOT MET</p> <p>B. MET</p> <p>C. MET</p>	<p>At 9.4%, the state met the target of 10.2% for Indicator 5B. At 58.9% and 3.6%, the targets of 59.5% and 3.5% for Indicators 5A and 5C respectively were not met; however, improvement continues to be shown for Indicator 5A.</p> <p>Analysis of statewide data shows that, with few exceptions, most districts have shown steady percentages in all placement areas for the past five years. As the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires LEAs to maintain a continuum of placement options and placement is an Individual Education Program (IEP) team decision, it is difficult to determine the percentages that are ultimately appropriate for each placement category. As described below, the state continues to emphasize placement in the LRE through technical assistance and professional development activities.</p> <p>After completing the SPP improvement activity evaluation process, which included reviewing improvement activities for this specific indicator, it was determined that two improvement activities needed revisions to wording to improve clarity.</p> <p>No revisions to targets.</p>	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this.</p>
6-ECSE LRE	<p>A. 47.3%</p> <p>B. 22.8%</p>	<p>Data reported to OSEP—includes K-eligible 5 year olds.</p> <p>A. 47.2%</p>	<p>C. NOT MET</p> <p>D. NOT MET</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION REQUIRED BY SEAP:</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
		B. 22.9%  Data excluding K eligible 5 year olds:  A. 30.0% B. 31.5%		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	None
7 – ECO (A) Positive social-emotional skills (B) Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (C) Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs	A1 92.7% A2 55.6% B1 93.8% B2 42.4% C1 90.7% C2 60.7%	A1 94.1% A2 51.3% B1 96.6% B2 43.3% C1 93.9% C2 59.5%	A1 MET A2 NOT MET B1 MET B2 MET C1 MET C2 NOT MET	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.	<p style="color: red;">No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
8 – Parent Involvement	≥80.1%	77.6%	NOT MET		<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None</p>
9 – Disproportionality	0.0%	0.0%	MET		<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
– all special ed					<p>or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator</p>
10 – Disproportionality 6 disability categories	0.0%	???	???	Thea complete writeup after reviews are completed. Anticipated mid-January. Will also know then if have Met/Not Met and whether or not will need to do Improvement Activities description.	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator.</p>
11 – Initial Evaluation Timelines	100%	97.6%	NOT MET	While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 97.6% of the time. The 97.6% rate is slight decrease from the previous year’s data of 97.9%	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator</p>
12 – C to B Timelines	100%	93.9%	NOT MET	With a 93.9% compliance rate, the State continues to see relatively high compliance with this indicator. However, the percentage for this APR did drop from 95.5% reported in 2011-12, and below 95% overall.	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
13 – Transitions Plans	100%	87.5%	NOT MET	<p>With a compliance rate of 87.5%, the state did not meet the 100% target for 2012-13, but did show progress from the previous year.</p> <p>Actual target data shows an increase in compliance from 2010-11 (79.4%) 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 our compliance percentage until all districts could be retrained on the new criteria. A training plan was developed and is being implemented and resulted in increased compliance for the 2011-12 school year. As evidenced by this increase, the state believes that continued training and technical assistance for districts will result in improved outcomes for the next APR.</p>	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator</p>
14 – Post-secondary follow-up	14A – 24.4% 14B – 46.9% 14C – 51.3%	14A – 29.2% 14B – 53.5% 14C – 57.7%	MET MET MET	At 29.2 (39.2)%, 53.5% and 57.7%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statements A (24.4%), B (46.9%) and C (51.3%) respectively.	<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator.</p>

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes	NOTES
15 – Correction of non-compliance	100%	99.8%	NOT MET	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.	<b>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</b>  ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator.
16 – Complaints	NA	NA	NA	Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR.	
17 – Due Process	NA	NA	NA	Per OSEP instructions, this indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR.	
18 – Resolution Sessions	≥35.3%	32.4%	NOT MET	The data for 2012-13 shows a decrease in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements from the previous year. <b>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.</b>	<b>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</b>  ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None
19 – Mediations	≥35.3%	94.3%	MET	Missouri met the 2011-12 target with 94.3% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.  <b>Mediation Agreement Trend Data</b>	<b>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</b>  ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator.

SPP Indicator	2012-13 Target	2012-13 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes			NOTES
					<b>Mediation Agreements</b>	<b>Total Mediations Held</b>	<b>Percent with Agreements</b>
				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>
20 – Timely & Accurate Data	100%	100%	MET	Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2012-13.			<p>No revisions are being made to the Improvement Activities or targets for this indicator.</p> <p>ACTION NEEDED BY SEAP: None required on this indicator</p>

Improvement Activities	Timeline	Resources	Status
1.14 Certify RPDC consultants for Train the Trainer for Dropout Prevention through the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, University of Minnesota	Active Added 2/13
1.15 Promote use of Missouri Connections through dissemination of information via SELs and regional and statewide trainings, meetings and conferences	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, Missouri Connections Staff, Office of College and Career Readiness Staff	Active Added 2/13
3.2 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.	2007/08-2012/13	Office of Special Education, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Revised 2/10 Revised 2/13
3.3 Provide information to various stakeholders on tiered models of student support	2010/11-2012/13	DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Added 2/10 Revised 2/11 Revised 2/13
3.4 Provide training/professional development to districts through the RPDC consultants on tiered models of student support	2010/11-2012/13	DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers	Active Added 2/10 Revised 2/11 Revised 2/13
3.10 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Inactive Added

plans.			2/10 Removed 2/13
4.5 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Inactive Added 2/10 Removed 2/13
5.1 Support the use of tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction).	2006/07-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active Revised 2/10 Revised 2/13
5.2 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on <b>evidence based instructional strategies</b> for differentiated instruction, tiered models of student support and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active Added 2/10 Revised 2/13
6.1 Support the use of tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices for Early Childhood Special Education.	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active Added 2/13
6.2 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 to the maximum extent appropriate.	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers	Active Added 2/13
6.3 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff,	Active

Consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.		RPDC Consultants	Added 2/13
6.4 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Added 2/13
6.5 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants	Active Added 2/13
7.5 Based on the outcome of a statewide pilot identify a common assessment tool and develop a plan for implementation.	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, Title 1, First Steps, and Early Childhood	Added 2/13
18.2 Develop and disseminate information on the Missouri IDEA complaint system through a variety of methods to parents, school staff, advocates and other interested parties.	2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, MPACT, CADRE	Active Added 2/13
19.1 Develop and disseminate information on the Missouri IDEA complaint system through a variety of methods to parents, school staff, advocates and other interested parties.	2010/11-2012/13	Office of Special Education Staff, MPACT, CADRE	Active Revised 2/13