

2011–12 Part B SPP/APR Summary (To be submitted to OSEP 2/1/13)

Last update: 11/20/2012

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
Overview				
1 – Graduation Rates	*2009–10: ≥74.5%*	*2009–10: 79.8%	*2009–10: MET	<p>Per instructions for the APR in the Measurement Table, 2009–10 data is reported for this 2010–11 APR. The data match the graduation rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p> <p>Missouri, with a graduation rate of 79.8% reported for ESEA purposes, met the established target for 2009–10 of 74.5%. As graduation rates are closely tied to dropout rates, for explanation of progress in graduation rates see description of progress for dropout rates in Indicator 2.</p> <p>No proposed revisions to targets. Two improvement activities added to the SPP to address work with Check and Connect in the state.</p>
2 – Dropout Rates	*2009–10: ≤4.9%*	*2009–10: 4.2%	*2009–10: MET	<p>Per instructions for the APR, 2009–10 data is reported for this 2010–11 APR. The data match the dropout rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p> <p>With a 4.2% dropout rate, the state met the 2009–10 target of 4.9% and saw a significant decrease in the dropout rate from the previous year of 5.0%. An analysis of data and evaluation of improvement activities related to dropouts yielded the following: Technical assistance from the NDPC-SD to a cohort of eight school districts resulted in a 9.8% decrease in the number of dropouts within the participating schools. Three of the participating schools are among some of the larger schools in the state and demonstrated a significant decline in their number of dropouts from 2009-10 to 2010-11.</p> <p>A further analysis of statewide dropout data shows that 27 additional school districts demonstrated significant declines in their dropout rate. Of those districts, ten were large school districts including the two of the largest in the state.</p> <p>No proposed revisions to targets. See Indicator 1 for two new improvement activities.</p>

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
3 – MAP	<p>A. Percent of districts meeting AYP: $\geq 37.0\%$</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: $\geq 95\%$</p> <p>C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – $\geq 75.5\%$ Math – $\geq 72.5\%$</p>	<p>A: 17.5%</p> <p>B: 99.3% (CA) 99.2%(Math)</p> <p>C: 27.0% (CA) 29.6% (Math)</p>	<p>A. NOT MET</p> <p>B. MET</p> <p>C. NOT MET</p>	<p>The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Indicator 3A decreased in 2011, due to the substantial annual increases in the proficiency targets.</p> <p>The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The state did not meet the proficiency targets established for Indicator 3C for 2010–11 which are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students. While the targets were not met, the state did see some progress in the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or advanced.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
4A – Discipline	*2009–10: $\leq 0.5\%$ of districts will have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates	*2009–10: 0.0% No districts were identified with significant discrepancies	MET	<p>For the 2009-10 school year (based on 2008-09 and 2009-10 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A, but ten districts were identified for Indicator 4B. This resulted in the state meeting the Indicator 4A target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The state will report on results of reviews for Indicator 4B in the clarification week response.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
4B—Discipline	0%	Reviews in progress. Per OSEP instructions results will be reported during clarification week in April 2012.	TBD	See 4A

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
5 – LRE	<p>A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class \geq 80% of the day: \geq59.5%</p> <p>B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: \leq10.2%</p> <p>C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: \leq3.5%</p>	<p>A. 58.6%</p> <p>B. 9.3%</p> <p>C. 3.6%</p>	<p>A. NOT MET</p> <p>B. MET</p> <p>C. NOT MET</p>	<p>With 58.6%, the state did not meet the target of 59.5% for Inside Regular Class \geq 80% (5A). At 3.6%, the state did not meet the target of 3.5% for Separate Settings (5C). With 9.3%, the state met the target of 9.6% for Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B). While the targets for 5A and 5C were not met, the data indicates progress from the previous years in both categories. Analysis of statewide data shows that, with few exceptions, most districts have shown steady percentages in all placement areas for the past five years. As the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires LEAs to maintain a continuum of placement options and placement is an Individual Education Program (IEP) team decision, it is difficult to determine the percentages that are ultimately appropriate for each placement category. As described below, the state continues to emphasize placement in the LRE through technical assistance and professional development activities.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
6 – ECSE LRE	NA	NA	NA	NA
7 – ECO	<p>A1 92.7%</p> <p>A2 55.6%</p> <p>B1 93.8%</p> <p>B2 42.4%</p> <p>C1 90.7%</p> <p>C2 60.7%</p>	<p>A1 94.0%</p> <p>A2 51.4%</p> <p>B1 95.6%</p> <p>B2 41.1%</p> <p>C1 93.0%</p> <p>C2 56.5%</p>	<p>A1 MET</p> <p>A2 NOT MET</p> <p>B1 MET</p> <p>B2 NOT MET</p> <p>C1 MET</p> <p>C2 NOT MET</p>	<p>At 94.0%, 95.6% and 93.0%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statement one for outcomes A (92.7%), B (93.8%) and C (90.7%). At 51.4%, 41.1% and 56.5%, Missouri did not meet any of the three targets for summary statement two for outcomes A (55.6%), B (42.4%) and C (60.7%).</p> <p>In reviewing data for the Missouri Part C Indicator 3, Missouri Part C also met the targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas and did not meet the targets for Summary Statement 2 for any of the three outcome areas. Missouri Part C has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age delay and does not serve at risk children. The results for this indicator are demonstrative of the State's eligibility criteria since the children who are entering the First Steps program show increased growth, yet they are not exiting at age expectations.</p> <p>Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children (66%) continue to be eligible and receive services in Part B, Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). As demonstrated in the data above, children receiving services in Part B (ECSE) continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes; however, due to the severity of disabilities of children transitioning from Part C, they are not exiting Part B performing at age expectations.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
8 – Parent Inv.	≥80.0%	71.4%	NOT MET	<p>With an agreement rate of 71.4%, the state did not meet the target of 80.0% established for the 2010–11 school year. Due to the process of using MSIP AQ data for this indicator, each year is comprised of a new set of districts making it difficult to analyze progress or slippage and any effects from the implementation of Improvement Activities. However, as can be seen from the chart above, the trend of agreement has clustered consistently around 70% with the exception of the 2007–08 data being slightly higher. As discussed above, the Department will no longer be conducting the advance questionnaires as a part of the MSIP process. The Office of Special Education is currently looking at alternative data collection measures for this indicator.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
9 – Dispro – all special ed	0.0%	0.0%	MET	<p>The state met the 2010–11 target of 0% of LEAs having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
10 – Dispro – 6 disability categories	0.0%	Reviews in progress. Results expected by January 1, 2012. Data will be entered at that time prior to submission to 2/1/12.	TBD	<p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
11 – Initial Eval Timelines	100%	97.8%	NOT MET	<p>At 97.8%, the state is not meeting the target of 100%, but is continuing to address this indicator at a high rate of compliance. The 97.8% rate is a 1% increase from the previous year. It has been determined through a review of the improvement activities that no changes or additions need to be made at this time.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
12 – C to B Timelines	100%	96.6%	NOT MET	<p>The comparison of school years 2006–07 through 2010–11 shows a significant increase from 80.3% to 96.6% within acceptable timelines. It is believed that the progress on this indicator is due to a focus in both the Part B and C systems on training and technical assistance for Part C agencies and Part B Early Childhood Special Education staff. A large statewide training on C to B Transition with approximately 300 attendees from both the Part C and B systems was held in April 2010. Materials, including a videotape of the training, were posted on the web with notification of the availability of the materials sent out over the Part C and B listservs. C to B Transition was also a topic of discussion in several of the Assistant Commissioner’s statewide webinars, as well as at regional and statewide conferences and meetings.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
13 – Transitions Plans	100%	79.4%	NOT MET	<p>Actual target data shows a significant drop in compliance from 2009–10 (91.3%) and 2010–11 (79.4%). During the 2010–11 monitoring year, the Office of Special Education Compliance Section determined that there was a need to change the procedures for monitoring certain criteria under indicator 13. At the time the decision was made, it was anticipated that this change would impact our compliance percentage until all districts could be retrained on the new criteria. A training plan has been developed and is being implemented. It is anticipated that the percentage will improve with the next APR and continue to improve in the future.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
14 – Post-sec follow-up	14A - 24.4% 14B – 46.9% 14C – 51.3%	14A – 30.2% 14B – 53.1% 14C – 58.6%	MET MET MET	<p>At 30.2%, 53.1% and 58.6%, Missouri met all three targets for summary statements A (24.4%), B (46.9%) and C (51.3%) respectively.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
15 – Correction of non-compliance	100%	100%	MET	<p>Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
16 – Complaints	100%	100%	MET	<p>Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
17 – Due Process	100%	100%	MET	<p>Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>

SPP Indicator	2010–11 Target	2010–11 Actual	Met/Not Met	APR Info/SPP Changes
18 – Resolution Sessions	≥35.3%	19.6%	NOT MET	<p>The data for 2010–11 shows a significant decrease from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. An analysis of due process data revealed that over half of the resolution sessions that were held but did not reach a settlement agreement were ultimately withdrawn.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
19 – Mediations	≥35.3%	95.3%	MET	<p>With 95.3% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.3% for 2010–11.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>
20 – Timely & Accurate Data	100%	100%	MET	<p>Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2010–11.</p> <p>No revisions to targets or improvement activities.</p>