

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

This State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) covers federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013, which is the State fiscal year of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 (2013-14).

Missouri Part C Infrastructure

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) is the lead State agency responsible for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention system, known as First Steps, is comprised of: (A) regional System Point of Entry offices; (B) a Central Finance Office; and (C) independent early intervention providers.

A. **Regional System Point of Entry Offices:** The State is divided into ten early intervention regions. The State of Missouri contracts with a single entity (System Point of Entry or SPOE) in each of the ten regions. The SPOEs are responsible for the local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

B. **Central Finance Office:** The State of Missouri also contracts with a CFO whose responsibilities include: enrolling and paying providers; fiscal management; and conducting regular reviews of provider accounts to ensure providers continue to meet the criteria as qualified personnel, including completion of module training, a review of provider licensure, liability insurance and criminal history checks.

The CFO also maintains the child data and IFSP system known as WebSPOE. The WebSPOE system contains all elements of referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. Data are entered in real-time and is accessible based on a user-level access in order to maintain privacy. The CFO provides a support help desk to trouble-shoot problems with users, which helps the Department ensure accurate data are entered in the system.

C. **Independent Early Intervention Providers:** All early intervention services are delivered by providers who meet the Department's qualifications. SPOEs organize and coordinate providers into Early Intervention Teams (EIT). EIT is Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Each team includes, at a minimum, an Occupational Therapist, Physical Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist, Special Instructor and Service Coordinator.

Lead Agency Staff

The Department's Office of Special Education employs staff in the Early Intervention section who are responsible for implementing and monitoring the Part C program. The early intervention section consists of: (A) Part C Coordinator; (B) regional Area Directors; and, (C) compliance staff.

A. **Part C Coordinator:** The Part C Coordinator oversees the implementation of the regulations and contractual obligations of the SPOEs and CFO, and coordinates with multiple State agencies including other sections at the Department. The Coordinator is also responsible for the supervision of the regional Area Directors and compliance staff.

B. **Regional Area Directors:** There are five Area Directors located in State offices throughout the SPOE regions. Each Area Director provides guidance and technical assistance in the areas of child find, public awareness, SPOE operations, compliance requirements and best practice to two SPOE offices. The Area Directors also conduct annual provider trainings and monthly monitoring of provider billing practices.

C. Compliance Staff: There are two Compliance staff that conduct annual compliance monitoring, document any findings of noncompliance and verify timely correction of all identified noncompliance. This staff is also responsible for investigating child complaints related to the Part C program.

WebSPOE Data System

The Department operates a secure, web-based child data system called WebSPOE. The system contains all elements of a child's record, including referral, evaluation, eligibility and IFSP information. The system is compliance driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. SPOEs utilize the system to record child and family demographic information and enter authorizations for providers to deliver early intervention services. Providers utilize the system to record progress notes, submit claims for delivered early intervention services and review payment history.

Given the extent of data available in WebSPOE, the system has become an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system. Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section utilize the system to conduct compliance monitoring and service monitoring activities.

Compliance Monitoring Procedures

The ten SPOEs are divided into two sets of five for monitoring purposes. Each set of SPOEs receives a compliance review every other year. Each set of five SPOEs is representative of the State as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar. The monitoring data reported in this SPP/APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records and SPOE staff interviews in accordance with compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard copy records and data in WebSPOE. Two randomly selected records from each Service Coordinator's caseload of active children in fiscal year 2013-14 were reviewed. The number of Service Coordinators reviewed ranged from seven in the smallest SPOE to 23 in the largest SPOE.

During the 2013-14 monitoring, if the SPOE had 80% to 99% compliance on an indicator, the SPOE had an opportunity to correct the instance prior to a finding being issued. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs had to be corrected: (1) the child level, with each individual case of noncompliance corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) the SPOE level, with the SPOE providing a new file demonstrating compliance with the indicator. If the SPOE was able to demonstrate correction of both prongs prior to a finding being issued, then no finding was issued and no corrective action was required.

However, if the SPOE had 79% or less compliance on an indicator, then a finding was issued and a corrective action was required for that indicator. The SPOE did not have the opportunity to correct these instances prior to a finding being issued.

For all findings issued, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the regulations. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

Service Monitoring Procedures

All early intervention services delivered in the Part C program are subject to federal, State and local monitoring. As part of the provider agreement to deliver early intervention services and as part of the SPOE contract requirements, providers and SPOEs must participate in routine monitoring of the services delivered to families in early intervention.

Providers are required to meet and maintain all standards, guidelines and policies for early intervention, including proper billing practices. The Department conducts regular monitoring in order to verify providers are documenting and claiming services in accordance with the Department's guidelines and instructions.

Examples of service monitoring procedures include a monthly review of the number of hours a day that providers billed for early intervention services, an annual review of timely claims submissions and investigation of complaints about provider billing practices. For each activity, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section review claims and progress notes to verify there is sufficient documentation to substantiate payments to providers. Additional documentation to support the provider payment may be requested from the provider. Staff may provide technical assistance or training to a provider regarding recordkeeping and billing practices.

Dispute Resolution System

The Missouri Part C complaint system includes three options to resolve disputes: (A) child complaint; (B) due process hearing; and, (C) mediation.

A. **Child Complaint:** A child complaint may be filed by any person or organization who believes there has been a violation of any State or federal regulation implementing Part C of the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with the Department, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by Compliance staff in the Early Intervention section. Decisions are issued within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made. If the Department, SPOE or provider is found out of compliance, the Department addresses in its decision how to remediate the noncompliance. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the parts of the complaint being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

B. **Due Process Hearing:** Requests for a due process hearing must be made in writing to the Department, Office of Special Education. A Hearing Officer is assigned to conduct the hearing and issue a written decision. A decision is issued within 30 days of the receipt of the request unless the timelines have been extended by the parties.

If the Department or the parent disagrees with the Hearing Officer's final decision, either party has a right to appeal the decision to a State or federal district court. The decision of the Hearing Officer is a final decision unless a party to the hearing appeals. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to due process requests and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

C. **Mediation:** Requests to settle disagreements through mediation may be made at any time, including prior to initiating a due process hearing or after a due process hearing has been requested. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on an impartial mediator selected from a list of qualified and trained mediators maintained by the Department. If mediation is successful, then a written agreement is developed. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings. Mediation must be completed within 30 days of the decision to mediate.

Missouri has a database to maintain data related to mediation cases and track timelines for mediation requests.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

System Point of Entry Contract

The State of Missouri contracts with a single System Point of Entry (SPOE) to operate the Part C program in each of the ten regions of the State. The SPOE contract is on a five year cycle. The current contract began July 1, 2014 and ends June 30, 2019. Each agency awarded the contract employs certain staff, including a SPOE Director and a sufficient number of Service Coordinators and support staff to administer the program within the designated region.

On an annual basis, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section review specific SPOE contract standards for child find, compliance, early intervention teams, IFSP meeting activities and a needs assessment plan. If a SPOE does not meet at least the minimum performance for each standard, liquidated damages are applied and a technical assistance plan is created to assist the SPOE with operations in the region.

The current SPOE contract contains requirements for working with families participating in Part C, including: (A) compliance standards; (B) best practices; and, (C) needs assessment.

A. Compliance Standards: Per contract requirements, each SPOE must comply with federal and State regulations for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and other laws or regulations related to the State's Part C program. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators, with help from the Area Directors. The Department conducts annual compliance monitoring to ensure SPOEs are implementing the regional program according to federal and State regulations.

B. Best Practices: Per contract requirements, each SPOE implements early intervention teams of providers to conduct evaluation and assessment activities and deliver early intervention services to families of children with disabilities. Missouri's team model was established using best practices for serving children in natural environments according to nationally recognized recommended practices. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to providers delivering services in the designated region, with help from the Area Directors.

C. Needs Assessment: Per contract requirements, each SPOE agency completes an annual needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment is to use data to identify the strengths and challenges in the regional system and identify areas that need training or technical assistance for Service Coordinators and providers in the region. The needs assessment includes observations of IFSP meeting activities and quality provider practices in home visits. Each SPOE Director is responsible for using multiple data sources to inform any adjustments to the regional plan.

Statewide and Regional Technical Assistance

Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide technical assistance in two ways: (A) statewide technical assistance; and, (B) regional technical assistance.

A. Statewide Technical Assistance: Staff provide guidance and instructions to SPOEs and providers on various topics related to Part C requirements, including: timely services; parental consent; the 45-day timeline; and transition from Part C to Part B. General Part C information is available statewide through the Department's website, including written documents such as a practice manual and webinars. In June of each year, staff provide face-to-face training for SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators to reiterate Part C

requirements and best practices in service delivery.

Additionally, information related to evidence-based practices in early intervention is provided to SPOEs and providers, including: natural environments; home visiting practices; child outcomes, and effective transitions. Guidance documents on evidence-based practices are available on the Department's website. On an annual basis, Area Directors provide statewide face-to-face trainings to SPOEs and providers to reinforce best practices for serving children with disabilities.

B. Regional Technical Assistance: In addition to statewide technical assistance, targeted technical assistance may be provided to a region based on a collection and review of different types of data in Missouri's Part C program. The need for regional technical assistance may be determined from a review of quantitative data (e.g., data posted monthly on the Department's website, canned reports available in the WebSPOE, etc.) or qualitative data (e.g., surveys of provider or Service Coordinator needs for additional information, training or meeting post-assessments, concerns about the quality of provider practices, etc.).

Targeted technical assistance is not intended to be a statewide activity, rather assistance to a specific region based on an identified need. However, if multiple regions are having the same issue, targeted technical assistance may become a statewide activity.

Through placing high emphasis on scheduled, statewide technical assistance, regular data reviews, targeted technical assistance and problem solving, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive technical assistance system for Missouri's Part C program.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Online Training Modules

The Department has online training available to provide basic information about the Part C program. There are six modules in the training series that provide an orientation to the Part C program and address the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement and delivery of services in the natural environment. The online training modules are reviewed and updated on an annual basis to ensure the content is consistent with all federal and State regulations or State laws governing the Missouri Part C program.

Each module includes content, video, resources and an assessment to measure competency related to the topic addressed in the module. The modules are provided at no-cost to the general public; however, individuals enrolling in the Missouri Part C program as an early intervention provider or Service Coordinator must successfully complete assessments.

Individuals enrolling as an early intervention provider are required to complete the first module, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to enrollment. Providers have six months from initial enrollment to complete the second, third and fourth modules. Modules five and six are optional for providers.

However, individuals enrolling as Service Coordinators are required to complete all six online training modules, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to accepting a caseload and conducting activities as a Service Coordinator.

Early Intervention Teams

The Missouri Part C program uses a transdisciplinary team approach to service delivery called an early intervention team (EIT). Teams are designated by the System Point of Entry (SPOE) to serve a specified area within the SPOE region. Each EIT must include at least one Service Coordinator, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist and Special Instructor. The number of teams per region is determined by the SPOE.

The EIT serves as the main source of providers for families in the Part C program. IFSP services are provided using a primary service provider approach where one professional from the team, or primary provider, is chosen by the IFSP team to serve as the main support to the family. Families requiring services from disciplines other than those represented on the EIT (i.e., ancillary providers) will receive those services from other disciplines enrolled with the Central Finance Office.

Throughout 2006 - 2008, Missouri explored various service delivery models and held numerous stakeholder meetings to solicit input from providers, Service Coordinators and parents. In 2009, Missouri began moving to a transdisciplinary team model with the award of SPOE contracts, which included a requirement to assign new families referred to the Part C program to an EIT. The SPOE contract listed four benchmarks for implementing teams as a way to scale-up the SPOE's capacity to manage teams. The final benchmark was 100% of new families assigned in 2012-13 and was successfully met in all regions.

Missouri's team model was established using the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document developed by the workgroup on principles and practices in natural environments, an OSEP TA community of practice for Part C settings. This document outlines the key principles and concepts for delivering services in natural settings as well as examples illustrating what the practice should "look like."

With the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, Missouri Part C staff developed five levels of training for Service Coordinators and providers who participate on teams. All five levels of training were disseminated using a face-to-face training format in 2009-10 through 2013-14. In addition to regular training, providers and Service Coordinators receive written information and technical assistance, as needed.

The content of the five training levels include an orientation to EIT practices, the distinction between EI and IFSP teams, how to conduct a routines-based interview and how to deliver support-based home visits. The State used various pieces of literature to develop the trainings, including the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document, peer-reviewed journal articles about evidence-based practices for assessing young children with disabilities and delivering effective home visits.

Benchmarks for Program Improvement

Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section recently developed a set of key measurements, or benchmarks, to continuously measure program improvement in Missouri Part C. The benchmarks were created through a compilation of various resources but the primary influence was the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document. Six benchmarks were selected as key processes in early intervention, including referral, assessment, services, exiting the program and support to professionals. Within each benchmark there are essential functions identified by staff in the Early Intervention section as indicators for implementation, measurement and evaluation of program improvement.

Beginning in State fiscal year 2016, at the end of each fiscal year, staff in the Early Intervention section will analyze data from the previous fiscal year to compile regional results for each benchmark. As a result of the compilation, each benchmark will have a performance rating of emerging, satisfactory or best practice for each SPOE region. The regional benchmarks will be analyzed to determine the area of greatest need and subsequent training or targeted technical assistance will be provided to the region in the following fiscal

year. In turn, the regional data will be compiled into one statewide rating for the program that is analyzed for overall progress towards statewide program improvement.

Through placing high emphasis on multiple methods to deliver evidence-based practices for young children with disabilities to providers and Service Coordinators, along with benchmarks for measuring regional performance to make data-driven decisions for training and technical assistance needs, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive professional development system for Missouri's Part C program.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from Department staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

When preparing the SPP/APR, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section send a draft SPP/APR document to Part B/619 staff in the Department for review and input prior to dissemination outside of the Department.

At the end of each calendar year, the Department sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which include parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The Department reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each SPOE compared to the targets established in the SPP/APR. The SPP/APR is posted when the State submits the report to OSEP.

The public report for each SPOE is compiled at the same time the SPP/APR is being prepared, and is posted within 30 days of the submission of the SPP/APR. The SPP/APR and the public report for each SPOE are posted on the Department's website on the SPP/APR page at: <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>.

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	69.00%	81.50%	89.90%	90.40%	87.50%	91.50%	81.60%	87.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,988	89

Explanation of Alternate Data

Data for timely services are derived from 89 child records reviewed for State monitoring and not the December 1 child count as presented in the 618 data.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
70	89	87.10%	100%	95.51%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

15

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The ten SPOEs are divided into two sets of five for monitoring purposes. Each set of SPOEs receives a compliance review every other year. Each set of five SPOEs is representative of the State as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar. See the General Supervision System section of the Introduction for more information on compliance monitoring procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	96.90%	97.40%	97.90%	98.00%	98.20%	98.90%	98.90%	99.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When preparing this SPP/APR, staff in the Department’s Early Intervention section sent a draft SPP/APR document to Part B/619 staff in the Department for review and input prior to dissemination outside of the Department.

In December, the Department sent a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which include parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held in January.

These groups were asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,955	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,988	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

intervention services in the home or community-based settings				
4,955	4,988	99.00%	95.00%	99.34%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2009	Target ≥					68.40%	69.20%	69.20%	
		Data				76.00%	69.10%	61.70%	74.60%	79.10%
A2	2009	Target ≥					53.50%	47.50%	47.50%	
		Data				59.40%	47.40%	41.00%	43.50%	38.40%
B1	2009	Target ≥					67.30%	70.40%	70.40%	
		Data				74.80%	70.30%	63.80%	76.90%	80.40%
B2	2009	Target ≥					51.40%	45.60%	45.60%	
		Data				57.10%	45.50%	41.80%	41.30%	38.50%
C1	2009	Target ≥					72.00%	73.10%	73.10%	
		Data				80.00%	73.00%	65.90%	78.20%	81.80%
C2	2009	Target ≥					41.70%	36.20%	36.20%	
		Data				46.30%	36.10%	32.50%	33.20%	31.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%
Target A2 ≥	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	47.50%
Target B1 ≥	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%
Target B2 ≥	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	45.60%
Target C1 ≥	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%
Target C2 ≥	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	36.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2,982
--	-------

Does the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	60
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	476
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,499
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	631
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	316

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	2,130	2,666	79.10%	69.20%	79.89%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	947	2,982	38.40%	20.00%	31.76%

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	73
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	426
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,479
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	749
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	255

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	2,228	2,727	80.40%	70.40%	81.70%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1,004	2,982	38.50%	20.00%	33.67%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
--	--------------------

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	73
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	422
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,717
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	613
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	157

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	2,330	2,825	81.80%	73.10%	82.48%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	770	2,982	31.10%	15.00%	25.82%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Definition of “comparable to same-aged peers”

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by Part C 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 Collecting and Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

- Each eligible child entering the Part C program must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months.
- Part C personnel determine the appropriate tools to collect assessment results for this indicator as personnel are not required to use a specific assessment instrument. However, Part C personnel must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results.
- In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C SPP/APR.
- Entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively.
- A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.”
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

- Since February 2011, all Part C entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system, WebSPOE, and the State analyzes the data at the end of each fiscal year. The reporting year for 2013-14 was the third full year that all ECO data for this indicator were pulled from WebSPOE instead of a manual tracking form. For the third consecutive year, the State continued to see an increase in the number of children with ECO data recorded in WebSPOE.
- After reviewing the use of the three sources of information for collecting ECO data, the State decided to conduct a Part C pilot project in 2012-13 to embed the ECO collection in IFSP meeting activities.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State has reported progress and actual target data for FFY 2013 in this APR.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2006	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	93.50%	92.30%	92.70%	94.60%	96.10%	96.80%	96.20%	96.90%
B	2006	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	95.60%	95.60%	95.90%	95.60%	97.60%	97.20%	97.20%	97.79%
C	2006	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	98.20%	96.30%	96.60%	97.40%	98.50%	97.70%	98.00%	98.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Target B ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.70%
Target C ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,093
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,040
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,081
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,053
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,076
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,056
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,075

	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	96.90%	95.00%	96.21%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	97.79%	95.00%	97.86%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	98.62%	95.00%	98.23%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Survey Methodology: As noted in previous APR submissions, the Department worked with the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) to evaluate the representativeness and reliability of the Part C Family Survey. As a result of this collaboration, changes to the 2007 survey included the addition of new items designed to meet the reporting requirements for the SPP/APR and to enhance subsequent analysis of survey data. In addition, a split survey methodology was used to explore the use of sampling versus a census approach to gathering yearly data. Several conclusions were drawn from analyzing the data from the split survey design:

- The two methods resulted in very similar rates of agreement.
- No non-response bias was evident by using the census methodology.
- Response rates by SPOE region did not differ between the two methodologies.
- Survey results were representative of the State as a whole.
- Either method (census or sample) is appropriate and produces valid and reliable data that adequately represent the population of the Part C program.

This survey was utilized in 2013-14. Using a census methodology, surveys were mailed to all families with a child in active IFSP status. If a family had more than one child in the Part C program, the family received more than one survey.

The response rate for 2013-14 was 21.5%, which is a slight decrease from the previous rate of 23%. An analysis of responses by SPOE indicates the response rates are comparable across the State.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The survey instrument used to collect data for this indicator can be found at: <http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/2014familysurvey.pdf>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

--

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.73%	0.76%	0.79%	0.82%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%
Data	0.71%	0.64%	0.76%	0.75%	0.84%	0.92%	0.97%	0.98%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	750	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	74,533	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
750	74,533	0.98%	0.80%	1.01%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		1.57%	1.59%	1.61%	1.64%	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%
Data	1.48%	1.37%	1.45%	1.55%	1.72%	1.96%	2.21%	2.23%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	4,988	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	224,921	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
4,988	224,921	2.23%	2.00%	2.22%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.90%	95.10%	95.30%	95.00%	100%	96.00%	100%	94.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
45	51	94.00%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	6
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Please see the description under State monitoring as described in indicator 1.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE completed an initial evaluation, initial assessment and initial IFSP meeting, although late, for each child whose 45-day timeline was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	60.10%	92.70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.40%	48.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
49	57	48.00%	100%	89.47%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Please see the description under State monitoring as described in indicator 1.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
26	26	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE developed a transition plan with steps and services, although late, for any child whose transition plan was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	64.00%	90.90%	94.70%	98.60%	100%	100%	95.10%	84.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
 No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
50	57	84.80%	100%	100%

Describe the method used to collect these data

Please see the description under State monitoring as described in indicator 1.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE notified (consistent with the opt-out policy adopted by the State) the LEA where the toddler resides, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	57.00%	78.10%	94.20%	92.60%	91.20%	100%	100%	92.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
49	57	92.90%	100%	100%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Please see the description under State monitoring as described in indicator 1.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE conducted a transition conference with family approval, although late, for any child whose transition conference was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures. This indicator is not applicable per instructions in the Part C SPP/APR Measurement Table.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1 Number of resolution sessions		
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements		

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop baseline and targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	69.10%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	71.10%	73.10%	75.10%	77.10%	79.10%

Description of Measure

This information is included in the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This information is included in the Overview and each Component of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

This information is included in Component 1 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

This information is included in Component 2 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

This information is included in Component 3 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Description

This information is included in Component 3 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

This information is included in Component 4 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

This information is included in Component 5 and Figure 8 of the SSIP document, which is under Attachments.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.