

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY18 (School Year 2018-19)

Missouri



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

559

General Supervision System

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

GENERAL SUPERVISION IN MISSOURI

Under federal statute and regulations, each state has a responsibility to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by local education agencies (LEAs). The system must be accountable for enforcing the requirements of the IDEA and for ensuring continuous improvement in outcomes for students with disabilities. The general supervision system in Missouri is the responsibility of the Office of Special Education (OSE). It is comprised of the following eight components:

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
2. Policies/procedures/effective implementation
3. Integrated monitoring activities
4. Fiscal management
5. Data on process and results
6. Improvement/correction/incentives/sanctions
7. Effective dispute resolution
8. Targeted technical assistance and professional development

INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) implements a three-year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education. DESE uses a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The objectives of the tiered monitoring process include:

- Monitor each LEA in a three year cycle
- Increase the number of LEAs meeting and maintaining compliance
- Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

LEAs are divided into three cohorts which cycle through the monitoring activities. Each cohort is comprised of just under 200 LEAs.

Year One (LEA Self-Assessment and DESE desk review verification):

- Self-assessment training is provided by DESE to LEA staff regionally and through resources posted on DESE's web site
- LEAs use the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS), a web-based general supervision management system, to conduct a self-assessment file review and submit data measuring the timely completion of initial evaluations and transition of children from Part C to Part B
- DESE staff verify the self-assessment results and initial evaluation and C to B transition data through a desk review

Year Two (Corrective Action Plan):

- DESE notifies LEAs of the results of the self-assessment and desk review verification

- LEAs submit for approval a corrective action plan (CAP) for each indicator found out of compliance during the self-assessment and/or desk review verification and implement the plan upon DESE approval
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates all noncompliance found for individual students has been corrected
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates the approved CAP was implemented and current practices are meeting compliance requirements for all indicators addressed in the CAP
- LEAs must demonstrate correction of noncompliance within one year of the date of the notification letter
- DESE conducts onsite reviews of selected LEAs based on risk assessment. Any identified noncompliance must be corrected within one year of the date of the notification letter

Year Three (Train and Maintain):

- LEAs continue to monitor their policies, practices and special education process and provide professional development opportunities to staff to ensure fidelity of implementation of the CAP

In addition to the three-year monitoring cycle, the following are conducted on an annual basis for all LEAs:

- Review of data reported through the state's data collection systems
- Identification and review of LEAs with significant disproportionality, disproportionate representation, or significant discrepancies in discipline
- Off-cycle onsite reviews as needed

More information is available on the DESE website.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM (STATE COMPLAINTS, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS)

Timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required to ensure compliant dispute resolutions. Effective collection of data enables DESE to track the issues identified to determine whether patterns or trends exist. Additionally, through tracking issues over time, it is possible for DESE to evaluate the resolution's effectiveness and determine whether resolution was maintained in future situations. It also allows the state to identify issues which may need to be addressed through technical assistance or monitoring procedures.

IEP facilitation has been offered statewide since the 2016-17 school year. State-contracted facilitators are available to implement the facilitated IEP meeting process statewide. The OSE received technical assistance from the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), as a member of the IEP Facilitation Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup #2. Three facilitators are trained as trainers in order to enable local public agency personnel to be facilitators at the local level.

MONITORING FOR VOLUNTARY COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA may not use more than 15% of the allocated amount under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER) grid, supporting data page, and CEIS Reporting Verification Form.

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with DESE staff from the Special Education Compliance, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections as needed. Through approval or disapproval of the Part B FER, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE

As indicated above, DESE implements a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The Special Education Finance Section uses the tiered

monitoring process to review LEAs for fiscal compliance of IDEA Part B federal funds, along with other special education funding sources.

All LEAs, regardless of cohort, go through the desk audit level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, proportionate share carryover release requests, and final expenditure reports (FERs).

All LEAs in the applicable cohort for the fiscal year, as well as selected high risk LEAs identified through the risk assessment process, complete the self-assessment through the web-based Tiered Monitoring System. The self-assessment serves as a tool for LEAs to determine compliance with federal fiscal regulations, identify any deficiencies, and subsequently implement procedural changes to correct such deficiencies.

The LEAs determined to be at highest risk for the fiscal year are selected for on-site monitoring through a risk assessment process which considers multiple factors. In addition, telephone monitoring and review of submitted documentation is used as needed for selected high risk LEAs.

The training and preparation level gives LEAs an opportunity to attend regional trainings on fiscal compliance; review LEA policies, procedures, and practices; and to become familiar with the Special Education Fiscal Monitoring Guide to ensure fiscal compliance. In addition, this level allows LEAs additional time to implement and assess any changes resulting from an on-site visit the previous year.

The fiscal areas reviewed during the monitoring cycles may include the following:

- Obligation of Funds
- Period of Availability
- Account Coding and Cash Management
- Internal Controls
- Procurement
- Allowable Costs/Use of Funds
- Time and Effort
- Equipment
- Capital Outlay
- Proportionate Share
- Coordinated Early Intervening Services
- Maintenance of Effort (MOE)

For the self-assessment/desk monitoring, telephone monitoring, and on-site monitoring levels, LEAs must correct deficiencies identified in CAPs.

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 LEAs.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN MISSOURI

The State implements a comprehensive system of technical assistance to ensure that LEAs, families and students with disabilities understand and can effectively and efficiently implement the statutory requirements of the IDEA and achieve improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

STATE COMPLIANCE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

To help LEAs prepare for the monitoring self-assessment, the Department provides annual training/technical assistance for completing the desk review self-assessment for compliance monitoring and fiscal compliance. Training is conducted in a variety of formats (face-to-face, webinars, Frequently Asked Questions) and at various times and locations to accommodate participation by LEA staff. Technical assistance is provided through phone and e-mail communication, as needed.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

The Department contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri. The purposes of the regional services are:

- To implement improvement activities which assist the state in meeting the targets specified in the Special Education State Performance Plan (SPP) for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and in meeting the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) of improving the performance of students with disabilities as well as ensuring that students with disabilities graduate and are college and career ready
- To expand the state's capacity to provide timely regional services to LEAs and schools with identified noncompliance and/or low performance for students with disabilities

Over 100 regional consultants in the following capacities provide training and technical assistance to LEAs throughout the State:

- Special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development to both special and general education teachers and administrators and provide ongoing coaching related to improving performance for students with disabilities
- Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor LEA SW-PBS coaches/facilitators and otherwise support LEAs in implementing SW-PBS
- Compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to LEAs to assist them with IDEA compliance requirements, self-assessments, as well as developing and implementing corrective action plans
- Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in the identification of and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted
- District Continuous Improvement (DCI)/Coaching Support Team consultants assist districts in moving toward district-level implementation of effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making and effective teaching practices) used in the DCI work. In this model, consultants work cross-regionally to accommodate the needs of participating LEAs

Project ACCESS

Project ACCESS provides autism and other pervasive developmental disorder (PDD) resource information, professional development and technical assistance to LEAs across Missouri and is 100% funded by the Department.

Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials individuals to present these courses through the RPDCs. Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators working with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs).

The Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD. BEAT coaches are chosen and trained to aid specific LEAs based on Project ACCESS criteria, which includes significant knowledge and expertise in ASD and reflects Project ACCESS' philosophy toward education of children with ASD.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (MSB) OUTREACH SERVICES

MSB provides outreach services to families and LEAs across the state in the areas of visual impairment, blind, and deaf/blind. The following projects/activities are a major part of this outreach:

- Deaf/blind Technical Assistance Program
- Library Media Center
- Missouri Instructional Resource Center
- MoSPIN*
- Professional Development
- Service Provider Listings
- Vision Education and Orientation & Mobility

*Missouri Statewide Parent Involvement Network (MoSPIN) is a statewide, home-based program to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired. MoSPIN provides direct, in-home parent education through specially trained “parent advisors.” The program is designed for parents of children who are visually impaired and who may also have other disabilities (developmental delay, hearing impairment, physical impairment, etc.). MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct service to the child.

MISSOURI SCHOOLS FOR THE SEVERELY DISABLED (MSSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

Outreach services available through the MSSD are designed to support LEAs serving students with moderate/severe disabilities. Assistance includes resources, personalized technical assistance and staff training. The following projects/activities are a major part of this outreach:

- Technical assistance
- LEA staff development related to instructional practice, curriculum and assessment
- IEP technical assistance specific to a student

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF (MSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

The Resource Center on Deafness at MSD is Missouri's main source for programs, services, information and resources supporting the educational needs of deaf and hard of hearing children. The MSD Resource Center provides a comprehensive range of programs and services to Missouri's deaf and hard of hearing children, their parents, and their LEAs from birth until high school graduation in order to maximize their educational achievement and psychosocial development. The Resource Center provides:

- American Sign Language (ASL) classes
- Families First: An early intervention program serving families of deaf and hard of hearing children from birth through age 8
- Parent advisors (professionals) in deaf-related fields including deaf education, speech pathology, audiology, or ASL interpreting
- Audiology services
- Comprehensive hearing evaluations
- Auditory Processing Disorder testing
- Hearing aid selection counseling, programming, fitting, cleaning, and repair
- Hearing aid bank
- FM System leases
- Speech-language assessments
- Community education and professional development including workshops, in-service training, and informational presentations for LEAs, hospitals and clinics, and parent and community organizations
- The Shared Reading Projects support literacy and language acquisition by helping parents learn to read to their deaf or hard of hearing child in ASL. Books and accompanying materials are loaned to families, and specially trained deaf adults tutor parents in effective ways to read to their deaf and hard of hearing children

MISSOURI-ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY (MO-AT)

MO-AT provides a variety of assistive technology statewide services to children, families, schools and adults. They provide the following services on behalf of the Office of Special Education for children/students birth to 21:

- Operates a short-term device loan program that allows schools and agencies to try-out devices prior to purchase
- Reimburses schools for the purchase of high-cost assistive devices for students with disabilities
- Supports an equipment exchange and recycling program that allows consumers to cost effectively buy “pre-owned” assistive devices
- Provides funding for home modifications and adaptive equipment for children with special health care needs
- Offers adaptive telephones and computer access devices for basic telephone and internet access
- Reviews new devices and software and provides advice and technical assistance to interested families and schools
- Coordinates a device demonstration program that provides individuals hand-on exploration of devices to meet their needs
- Supports agency conformity to state IT access statutes and standards
- Delivers technical assistance, consultation and training support to agency staff and educators statewide.

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY (MSU) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Through a contract with the OSE, the Missouri State University (MSU) Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic provides consultative services to LEAs in Missouri educating children who have cochlear implants. Consultations and trainings are designed to enhance teacher and LEA knowledge and skills to carry out the services to increase student achievement.

MISSOURI SCHOOLWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS (MO SW-PBS)

The mission of MO SW-PBS is to assist LEAs and schools in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

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

MISSOURI PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION (PTI) CENTER - MISSOURI PARENTS ACT (MPACT) PARENT MENTORS

Through a contract with the OSE, the MPACT manages a volunteer Parent Mentor Program to provide support to families of children with disabilities throughout the special education decision making process. Supports include providing resources and information regarding special education law and process, assisting parents to plan for school meetings, and attending IEP or other school meetings with families. Mentors also help parents understand their role in the IEP process. Mentors complete a required training curriculum that assists in their work with families. The MPACT staff meets with the mentors on a quarterly basis for additional updates and training.

DISTRICT CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (DCI)

District Continuous Improvement (DCI) is an opportunity offered to districts in an effort to advance and sustain effective educational practices. Using a district-level approach, the goal is to integrate effective academic and behavioral practices into a framework for achieving exceptional student outcomes. The initial cohort of districts began working in the spring of 2017.

Outcomes

Through this approach, DESE seeks to achieve and facilitate the development of a system of support at the district level to achieve exceptional outcomes for all students. This partnership between DESE and districts will work toward the following outcomes:

- Refinement of an integrated academic and social/behavioral framework into a cohesive DCI system of support approach that can be implemented statewide in any district, regardless of demographics
- Collection of data pointing to the non-negotiables (what works) and data pointing to elements of flexibility to implementing in various contexts
- Implementation of effective educational practices (teaching, learning, and leadership), resulting in exceptional outcomes for all students, especially students showing risk factors, including students with disabilities.

Description of participation

Districts collaborate with DESE to do the following:

- Engage in an in-depth implementation and evaluation of integrated academic and behavioral practices framework leading to improved instruction and student learning
- Provide insights for shaping the future of the statewide model
- Build internal capacity and expertise to support ongoing district/school-based coaching
- Share lessons learned and insights with other districts
- Engage in a data-driven process.

Key activities

The following key activities describe the role of participating districts:

- Participate in site visits from the DESE and coaching support team as a district leadership team
- Participate in data collection, which may include videotaping (consistent with district policy), interviews with educators, and surveys
- Engage in regional and state meetings for professional development
- Provide ongoing feedback and recommendations for improvement of the framework and process
- Engage consistently with a coaching support team
- Engage in district and building level professional development as determined in collaboration with the coaching support team.

Support for active engagement and implementation with fidelity

In order to support the involvement of districts, DESE will provide for the following:

- Coordination of training and coaching for the districts/buildings
- Development of school-based implementation coaching at the district and building levels
- Resources and supports to allow the districts and buildings to participate
- On-site technical assistance and observation visits
- Cross-district collaboration and sharing

DCI districts and participating buildings will receive ongoing support from a designated coaching support team. Additionally, districts will have access to DESE endorsed training and professional development materials. The coaching support teams will primarily work with the district leadership team. Coaching support teams may also work with building leadership teams; however, it is expected that district leadership will be involved in supporting the building leadership teams to be effective. Technology to deliver professional development and foster collaboration is emphasized in the DCI work.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN MISSOURI

The State implements a comprehensive system of professional development to ensure that service providers have the skills needed to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

Continuous professional development is provided for the following consultants located in the nine RPDCs: Compliance Consultants, Improvement Consultants, SW-PBS Consultants, and DCI Consultants. The professional development is provided through monthly team meetings, webinars and/or shared learning events with OSE staff related to the described scope of work according to the contract with the Department. The required meetings are designed to develop the capacity of the regional consultants to provide high quality professional development (HQPD) in their regions in order to assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators specified in the SPP and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). These targets and indicators are focused on improving the performance of all students, but especially students with disabilities, so they will graduate and are college and career ready.

STATE PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT GRANT (SPDG)

In October 2017, Missouri was awarded a five-year SPDG. The DCI project described above encompasses all elements of the previous SPDG work, but emphasis is placed on district-level implementation as opposed to building-level implementation. The districts were representative of all regions of the state and were demographically diverse. Currently 147 districts or approximately one fourth of Missouri districts participate in the DCI.

LEAs participating in DCI are supported by coaching support teams comprised of consultants who assist in moving toward district-level implementation of the effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative

assessments, data-based decision making and effective teaching practices) used in the DCI work. In this model, consultants work cross-regionally to accommodate the needs of the participating LEAs.

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) is the state alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The Department has trained staff in the Office of College and Career Readiness (OCCR) Assessment Section and the OSE on the administration of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Assessment, as well as the instructional support system which accompanies the assessment. These staff regularly train the RPDC Improvement Consultants on this same information so consultants can effectively train LEAs across the state. In addition, DLM staff works with and trains all RPDC Improvement Consultants annually on new information and technology available to educators. The RPDC Improvement Consultants provide training and technical assistance statewide to educators administering the DLM Alternate Assessment.

DESIRED RESULTS DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE (DRDP) ©

The Missouri State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)®, a research-based, observation readiness tool, as the Department's recommended early childhood instrument for use with preschool age children. Eleven regional consultants were provided training by WestEd to become credentialed Certified Coach Trainers (CCTs). These consultants provide statewide training for professionals who work with preschool age children on use of the DRDP® instrument.

MISSOURI EARLY WARNING SIGNS

Early Warning Signs (EWS) is a data-driven decision-making process allowing educators to identify students at-risk by examining the underlying causes, match interventions to student needs, and monitor the progress of interventions. EWS examines five essential areas: adult advocates, academic support, classroom/social/behavioral issues, personalized learning environment/instructional practice, and necessary skills for graduation and post-school success. Data indicators are most predictive of a given student outcome as a "warning sign" that a student is in trouble. This system allows educators to track interventions assigned to particular students and track the associations between interventions and outcome for students.

MISSOURI POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS PROJECT

Missouri Post-Secondary Success Project is a multi-year improvement process which assists schools in embedding college and career competencies in curriculum through professional development for teams. The overall goal of this work is to support teams of high and middle school professionals to expand the college and career competencies (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cognitive skills) of students through data-based decision making, multi-tiered instruction and interventions, and collaboration. The college and career competencies provide a unifying vernacular that supports school personnel, families, community members, and students to work together to improve post-secondary outcomes for all students. Outcomes of the project include: increased intra and interpersonal student competencies; improved academic and behavioral achievement; increased graduation rates; and improved post-school outcomes of students with and without disabilities. The implementation stages are structured to optimize successful start-up, purposeful innovation, scaling-up, and sustainability. Stages of implementation include exploration, initial implementation, full implementation, and sustainability. Full implementation and sustainability involve a collaborative effort between parents, community members and educators to develop a culture of supporting youth with college and career competencies that lead to positive post-secondary outcomes.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the Office of Special Education and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 6, 2019, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

The original proposal to the SEAP was to set the extended FFY 2019 targets equal to the FFY 2018 targets, knowing that there may be changes to the SPP/APR indicators within the next year which would necessitate making substantive changes, including resetting baselines and developing new targets for multiple years. The SEAP agreed with that approach for the most part, but there was also discussion about setting more rigorous targets where indicated by historical trend data. In response to this discussion, FFY 2019 targets were adjusted for Indicators 1 and 2.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF LEA DATA

The Special Education District Profiles are public reports of LEA data and are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>. Scroll to the Special Education Profiles section and select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a school year and district and click the View Report button, then use the arrows to advance through the pages of the report. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF STATEWIDE DATA AND STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

The state's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on DESE's website at https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/se-data-state-profile_2019.pdf as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. In most cases, data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.

The SPP and APR documents are posted on DESE's website at <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a Special Education Listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	68.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%
Data	73.36%	75.27%	76.56%	77.46%	76.89%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	74.00%	74.50%

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,764
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,608
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	75.76%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,764	7,608	76.89%	74.00%	75.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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

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

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	5.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%
Data	2.92%	3.08%	2.36%	2.20%	2.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	4.80%	3.50%

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,003
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	400

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	40
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	892
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	30

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

Calculation is an annual event dropout rate = number of IEP dropouts from grades 9-12 / number of IEP students in grades 9-12.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
837	38,597	2.24%	4.80%	2.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Dropouts include any students who exit high school without receiving a high school diploma (receiving a certificate, reaching maximum age, dropping out). Conditions for dropping out for students with disabilities are the same as for all students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	99.54%	99.88%	99.86%	99.49%	99.54%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	99.50%	99.89%	99.86%	99.40%	99.44%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	67,016	66,720	99.54%	95.00%	99.56%	Met Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	67,050	66,712	99.44%	95.00%	99.50%	Met Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available on DESE's MCDS Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>

State, district, and school level data, including state level participation and proficiency, and district and school level participation, are under the Special Education "Part B Federal Reporting" section.

State and district level Special Education Profiles are under the Special Education "Special Education Profiles" section. To run the district level report, select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. Click the View Report button. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

Also available on the MCDS Portal are state, district, and building level proficiency data for all students as well as the following subgroups: children with disabilities on regular assessments (IEP Non MAPA), children with disabilities on alternate assessments (MAP-Alternate or IEP MAPA), and all children with disabilities (IEP_student). To access these data, on the MCDS left hand menu, select the "Students" category, then the "Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Data" subcategory. Select "Achievement Level 4 Report – Public" report. Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (State Overall, District Overall, and/or select schools within the district), Content Area(s), Category (select Special Programs and Total), Type (select IEP MAPA, IEP Non MAPA, IEP_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). Click the View Report on the upper right side of screen.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	23.20%	26.49%	27.00%	29.00%	18.55%
A	Overall	18.55%	Actual	23.22%	26.49%	29.17%	28.67%	18.55%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	26.40%	17.32%	18.00%	20.00%	14.10%
A	Overall	14.10%	Actual	26.46%	17.32%	18.63%	18.18%	14.10%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	20.00%	20.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	15.00%	15.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	66,720	11,762	18.55%	20.00%	17.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	66,712	9,435	14.10%	15.00%	14.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available on DESE’s MCDS Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>

State, district, and school level data, including state level participation and proficiency, and district and school level participation, are under the Special Education “Part B Federal Reporting” section.

State and district level Special Education Profiles are under the Special Education “Special Education Profiles” section. To run the district level report, select “Special Education Profile Report – Public.” Select a Year and District. Click the View Report button. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

Also available on the MCDS Portal are state, district, and building level proficiency data for all students as well as the following subgroups: children with disabilities on regular assessments (IEP Non MAPA), children with disabilities on alternate assessments (MAP-Alternate or IEP MAPA), and all children with disabilities (IEP_student). To access these data, on the MCDS left hand menu, select the “Students” category, then the “Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Data” subcategory. Select “Achievement Level 4 Report – Public” report. Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (State Overall, District Overall, and/or select schools within the district), Content Area(s), Category (select Special Programs and Total), Type (select IEP MAPA, IEP Non MAPA, IEP_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). Click the View Report on the upper right side of screen.

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	2.86%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	2.86%	3.00%
Data	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.85%	2.85%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

496

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	38	0.00%	2.85%	5.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage is due to two districts meeting significant discrepancy criteria based on data from the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years. No districts were identified the prior year resulting in slippage from zero to two districts, or 0.00% to 5.26%. Both districts completed a review of policies, procedures, and practices. Neither district subsequently met criteria based on data from the 2018-19 school year.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

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

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short suspensions are counted as a single incident for a student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2017 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 563 LEAs reported in FFY2017 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot County Special School District
- Less 38 LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 496 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal/progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment starting a new monitoring cycle. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. An onsite review is required after two complete cycles, however the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on an analysis of the data from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal/progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

506

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	28	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

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

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short suspensions are counted as a single incident for a student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2017 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 563 LEAs reported in FFY2017 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 28 LEAs that met the state's minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts)
- Results in 506 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts).

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities, and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal/progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment starting a new monitoring cycle. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. An onsite review is required after two complete cycles, however the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and

compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on an analysis of the data from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal/progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target >=	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%
A	55.80%	Data	58.10%	57.65%	57.59%	57.36%	57.04%
B	2006	Target <=	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
B	10.60%	Data	9.11%	8.92%	8.76%	8.58%	8.45%
C	2006	Target <=	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%
C	3.70%	Data	3.63%	3.66%	3.61%	3.63%	3.57%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	56.00%	56.00%
Target B <=	10.20%	10.20%
Target C <=	3.65%	3.65%

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	114,033
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64,712
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,514
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	3,471

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	1
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	696

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64,712	114,033	57.04%	56.00%	56.75%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,514	114,033	8.45%	10.20%	8.34%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	4,168	114,033	3.57%	3.65%	3.66%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
A	47.20%	Data	47.01%	45.14%	44.19%	43.53%	43.62%
B	2011	Target <=	32.00%	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%
B	22.90%	Data	22.68%	24.15%	25.02%	24.57%	24.96%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	47.30%	47.30%
Target B <=	22.80%	22.80%

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,253
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	8,012
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,543
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	212
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	8,012	18,253	43.62%	47.30%	43.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,755	18,253	24.96%	22.80%	26.05%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Not applicable
B	The state had an increase of just over one percent, from 24.96% to 26.05%, from the prior year for indicator 6B which is a continuation of a very gradual upward trend over the past several years. This increase can be attributed to two primary systemic factors: 1) the state does not have universal PK programming, and in many parts of the state, there are limited options for regular early childhood programs, and 2) the state's funding mechanism for early childhood special education (ECSE) reimburses LEAs for all costs of the ECSE program, but reimbursement is limited to services for students with disabilities. To receive full reimbursement for special education, over 50% of the students in an integrated classroom must be students with disabilities. In an attempt to encourage districts to create more blended classrooms, the OSE worked with Title I and the state Missouri Preschool Program to create a single set of requirements and processes that would allow for multiple funding sources. It will take time for LEAs to move to a model such as this.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target >=	93.83%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%
A1	93.83%	Data	93.83%	94.76%	94.98%	95.80%	95.69%
A2	2013	Target >=	48.10%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%
A2	48.10%	Data	48.10%	45.97%	47.16%	44.84%	42.16%

B1	2013	Target >=	95.48%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%
B1	95.48%	Data	95.48%	95.80%	96.35%	96.95%	96.16%
B2	2013	Target >=	40.51%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
B2	40.51%	Data	40.51%	37.97%	38.89%	38.71%	37.00%
C1	2013	Target >=	93.48%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%
C1	93.48%	Data	93.48%	93.61%	95.23%	95.42%	95.51%
C2	2013	Target >=	56.79%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
C2	56.79%	Data	56.79%	54.19%	56.86%	54.28%	52.17%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	93.90%	93.90%
Target A2 >=	48.20%	48.20%
Target B1 >=	95.50%	95.50%
Target B2 >=	40.60%	40.60%
Target C1 >=	93.50%	93.50%
Target C2 >=	56.90%	56.90%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

5,509

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	77	1.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	122	2.21%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,987	54.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,641	29.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	682	12.38%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4,628	4,827	95.69%	93.90%	95.88%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,323	5,509	42.16%	48.20%	42.17%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	84	1.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	80	1.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,340	60.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,707	30.99%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	298	5.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	5,047	5,211	96.16%	95.50%	96.85%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,005	5,509	37.00%	40.60%	36.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	87	1.58%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	103	1.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,482	45.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,027	36.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	810	14.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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 6 years of age or exited the program.	4,509	4,699	95.51%	93.50%	95.96%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6	2,837	5,509	52.17%	56.90%	51.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program.							

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1–5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument to gather data for this indicator. Therefore, an approved list of instruments has not been compiled. However, the State of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the recommended instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, training began for ECSE staff in the administration of this assessment. Some ECSE programs began voluntary usage of the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year. The DRDP continues to be the recommended Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool, but the number of LEAs using this instrument is unknown.

Regardless of the instruments used, the Decision Tree for Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Rating Discussion and the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) are available to assist ECSE personnel in synthesizing information into a comprehensive summary. The Decision Tree is a technical assistance document that assists ECSE personnel in reviewing the assessment results and determining an appropriate ECO rating. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to DESE. The Decision Tree is located online at <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/ecodecisiontree1-25-13.pdf>, and the MOSS is located at <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MissouriOutcomesSummarySheetREV1109.pdf>.

No sampling is used for gathering ECO data. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more are assessed. Entry and exit data must be determined within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.” All entry and exit data collected during a given year is submitted electronically to DESE at the end of that school year. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

More information can be obtained at <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training>.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	69.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Data	74.52%	73.57%	75.65%	72.71%	74.41%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	70.00%	70.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,588	6,067	74.41%	70.00%	75.62%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

45,435

Percentage of respondent parents

13.35%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

DESE uses a single survey for all students with disabilities. Districts are instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of all students with disabilities, including preschool students.

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 11.2% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	NA
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The 2019 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 188 LEAs (cohort) that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes.

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

The monitoring cohort surveyed during the 2018-19 school year included 188 LEAs. Responses were received from 170 LEAs (90% LEA response rate), which represented approximately 97% of the students with disabilities in the cohort’s LEAs. A total of 6,163 surveys were completed, 45% by mail and 55% electronically. The return rate for 2018-19 data was 13.6% which was a decrease of 1.6% from the prior year. The mean LEA response rate was 21.0%; the median LEA response rate was 17%. Of the 18 LEAs that did not have any survey responses, all but two had fewer than 40 students with disabilities. Note that while 6,163 surveys were completed, only 6,067 responded to the questions used for Indicator 8, resulting in the 13.35% return rate calculated by the system.

In order to determine representativeness of the data, respondents’ geographic location was examined via Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) areas. The response rates were similar across regions, with a slightly smaller than expected percent of responses from the Kansas City region. This is due to several medium-sized LEAs and one large LEA that had low response rates despite the state’s efforts to follow up with LEAs that have lower response rates.

“Age of student” was also examined via the school types of preschool, elementary, and secondary. The data indicated that responses by school type (proxy for age of student) are representative of the state since the percent of responses was within 10% of the percent of child count for each school type.

Data analysis also indicates that the respondents are racially/ethnically representative of the state. A comparison across all LEAs, the LEAs in the monitoring cohort surveyed in the 2018-19 school year, and the LEAs in the monitoring cohort with survey responses showed similar demographics, except that the surveyed LEAs had a lower percentage of responses from the white population (63.6% compared to 71.0% for all LEAs) and a higher percentage of responses from the black population (26.1% compared to 18.0% for all LEAs). This is explained by a number of larger urban districts in the surveyed cohort.

In summary, the review of data by geographic location, age of student, and race/ethnicity indicates that the parents that responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. However, we do recognize that the higher the response rate, the better the data. Therefore, in addition to our current practices, we will employ additional follow-up with LEAs that have lower response rates in order to increase overall return rates for the survey.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

382

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	148	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes related to the disproportionate representation. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal/progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment starting a new monitoring cycle. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on an analysis of the data from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal/progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2018 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 559 LEAs reported in FFY2018 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 148 LEAs that met the state's minimum n-size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 382 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

471

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5	0	59	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes related to the disproportionate representation. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal/progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment starting a new monitoring cycle. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on an analysis of the data from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal/progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The five LEAs identified through data analysis as having disproportionate representation were reviewed using monitoring procedures described above. All completed the self-assessment and developed goals and activities for improvement, or provided a goal/progress report. In all five LEAs, policies, procedures, and practices were found not to result in inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2018 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 559 LEAs reported in FFY2018 Introduction which includes the two special school districts the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 59 LEAs that met the state’s minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 471 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	94.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.99%	97.97%	98.81%	99.46%	99.09%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7,552	7,477	99.09%	100%	99.01%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

75

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

Delays for the 75 children ranged from seven days to 87 days. The longest delays were due in part to excessive numbers of snow days, school breaks, and inability to contact parents. While these reasons are considered acceptable extensions to the timelines, the reasons did not fully explain the total

delay so LEAs were cited for noncompliance with the timelines. A small number of delays were due to delays in completion of evaluations.

In general, the unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable included valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons), delayed evaluations, or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The state uses a 60-day timeline for initial evaluations but allows the following as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

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

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children for whom an initial evaluation was conducted. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

Districts enter the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

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

Verification of the LEA reported evaluation timeline data is completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned staff.

The file review verification process includes checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the LEAs include initial evaluation timelines which are not within 60 days, the criteria listed above are accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines. Delays are considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions do not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the LEA fails to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
48	48	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR. Data reflecting the 2016-17 school year, and reported in the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2017, which is FFY 2017. More specifically, LEAs submitted data reflecting the 2016-17 school year to DESE in May 2017. The DESE Special Education Compliance staff conducted data verification over the summer, and final reports were issued to the LEAs in September 2017. Due to the spring submission of data from LEAs and the number of LEAs reviewed each year, reports are not issued until early the following fiscal year.

In FFY2017, there were 48 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 27 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children with initial evaluations. The state verified through this follow-up that all 27 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY2017, there were 48 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 27 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 27 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 48 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	95.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.83%	95.45%	97.51%	98.54%	98.33%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	662
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	106
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	368
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	3
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	182

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	368	368	98.33%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
0

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

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

LEAs enter the following information for each child referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Child's name
- Date of birth
- Date of referral to ECSE
- Date of referral to First Steps (Part C)
- Parental consent received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible (Y/N)
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason (Y/N)

The information is reviewed by DESE compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR. Data reflecting the 2016-17 school year, and reported in the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2017, which is FFY 2017. More specifically, LEAs submitted data reflecting the 2016-17 school year to DESE in May 2017. The DESE Special Education Compliance staff conducted data verification over the summer, and final reports were issued to the LEAs in September 2017. Due to the spring submission of data from LEAs and the number of LEAs reviewed each year, reports are not issued until early the following fiscal year.

In FFY 2017, there were six individual child level findings of noncompliance in five LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children who transitioned from Part C to Part B. The state verified through this follow-up that all five LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY 2016, there were six individual child level findings of noncompliance in five LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all five LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all six findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	91.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.63%	88.58%	88.29%	87.67%	94.42%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
514	549	94.42%	100%	93.62%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The special education monitoring is done on a three-year continuous cycle of Year 1 - self-assessment submitted for desk review, Year 2 - correction of identified noncompliance, and Year 3 - training for improvement.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs

to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

LEAs complete a file review on transition age students and address the following statements for each student:

- 200.610.b: For students beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child is 16, post-secondary transition is stated as a purpose of the meeting, at least annually or whenever post-secondary transition is to be discussed at the IEP meeting.
- 200.710.b: For IEP meetings addressing secondary transition services, the child is invited.
- 200.710.c: If the child was age 16+ and did not attend any meeting where the purpose is the consideration of post-secondary goals, documentation must be present that the child's preference and interests related to transition services were considered at the IEP meeting.
- 200.790.a: No later than the child's 17th birthday, the IEP includes a statement that the child has been informed of the rights under IDEA that will transfer to the child upon her/his 18th birthday.
- 200.800: The IEP for each student beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child reaches 16 years of age and updated annually includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals.
- 200.800.a: A measurable postsecondary goal (or goals) that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.
- 200.800.b: Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s).
- 200.800.c: Transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.d: If appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- 200.800.e: The measurable postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment.
- 200.800.f: The transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.g: The transition services were developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests.
- 200.800.i: There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed.

Compliance supervisors review and verify LEA documentation based on the above standards. LEAs identified with noncompliance are required to address individual student noncompliance and complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Documentation of correction is submitted for review and verification.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
91	91	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR. Data reflecting the 2016-17 school year and reported in the FFY 2016 (2016-17) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2017, which is FFY 2017. More specifically, LEAs submitted student file reviews and documentation reflecting the 2016-17 school year to DESE in April 2017. The DESE Special Education Compliance staff conducted data verification over the summer, and final reports were issued to the LEAs in September 2017. Due to the spring submission of data from LEAs and the number of LEAs reviewed each year, reports are not issued until the beginning of the following fiscal year.

In FFY 2017, there were 91 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 68 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of IEP secondary transition plan data. The state verified through this follow-up that all 68 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY 2017, there were 91 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 68 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 68 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 91 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
A	23.38%	Data	29.13%	31.03%	29.55%	28.50%	25.52%
B	2009	Target >=	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
B	45.94%	Data	55.62%	59.49%	60.89%	59.67%	58.25%
C	2009	Target >=	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%
C	50.33%	Data	60.58%	64.79%	65.90%	64.29%	62.90%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	24.40%	24.40%
Target B >=	46.90%	46.90%
Target C >=	51.30%	51.30%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,345
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,852
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,403
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	241
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	104

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,852	7,345	25.52%	24.40%	25.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,255	7,345	58.25%	46.90%	57.93%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,600	7,345	62.90%	51.30%	62.63%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Missouri differs from most, if not all, states in that the state receives follow-up status on the entire population of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left school.

LEAs are responsible for conducting the follow-up on former students and for reporting the data to the state. The state data collection mechanism requires that all LEAs report a follow-up status for each applicable youth. If an LEA is not able to locate former students in order to ascertain their status, the follow-up status reported is "unknown." "Unknown" responses are included in the number of respondent youth (denominator of the calculations), but not in sections A, B, or C.

Therefore, since the state uses this census data collection requiring that a follow-up status be reported by LEAs for all applicable youth, the data included in this APR are 100% representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	10
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	46.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	37.84%	44.44%	52.94%	58.97%	21.74%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6	10	21.74%	35.30%	60.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	17
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	9

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	66.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	90.00%	87.50%	80.95%	66.67%	81.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	9	17	81.82%	35.30%	64.71%	Met Target	No Slippage