

MO Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

563

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

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

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

- Reduce the time spent in LEAs conducting on-site monitoring reviews
- Improve quality and efficiency of on-site reviews
- Increase the number of LEAs given formal review
- Increase the number of LEAs meeting compliance
- Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

The tiered monitoring process is used to ensure adequate monitoring of all LEAs, along with additional opportunities to monitor LEAs with high-risk factors. Under the tiered monitoring process, LEAs are sorted into three cohorts, with approximately 200 LEAs per cohort.

Each cohort cycles through multiple tiers/levels of monitoring, including the following:

- Desk audit – a desk audit uses data reported through the state’s data collection systems to annually monitor 100% of LEAs. Data include, but are not limited to, teacher certification, highly qualified teacher status, financial data (including maintenance of effort, CEIS budget applications, single audit findings, payment requests, final expenditure reports) discipline, disproportionate representation, graduation rate, dropout rate, post secondary transition, early childhood outcomes, dispute resolution and student performance.
- Desk review – conducted on a three-year cycle through a self-assessment monitoring checklist and verification of the checklist. The self-assessment information is collected and reported through the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS).
- Phone audit/Onsite– LEAs with fewer risk factors receive a telephone audit. LEAs that are identified with high risk factors receive an onsite review.

Monitoring reports are issued to all agencies reviewed during the three-year cycle.

MONITORING FOR PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE

The Special Education Compliance Section uses the tiered monitoring process to review LEAs for procedural compliance with IDEA Part B.

Desk audit – All LEAs, regardless of which cohort the LEA is assigned to, goes through a data review each year. A desk audit uses data reported through the state’s data collection systems to annually monitor 100% of LEAs. Data include, but are not limited to, teacher certification, highly qualified teacher status, discipline, disproportionate representation, graduation rate, dropout rate, post-secondary transition, early childhood outcomes, dispute resolution, and student performance.

· Desk review – conducted on a three-year cycle. The same data is reviewed as above to identify any SPP indicators not met with additional information collected through a self-assessment monitoring checklist (see attachment) and verification of the self-assessment checklist. The self-assessment information is collected and reported through IMACS (see below).

· Phone audit/Onsite– LEAs that are identified with high risk factors receive an onsite review. LEAs with fewer risk factors receive a telephone audit.

Only the applicable cohort for the monitoring year will complete the self-assessment/desk monitoring level. This level of monitoring is completed through the web-based Tiered Monitoring System (IMACS). The self-assessment/desk monitoring level serves as a tool for LEAs to determine where the LEA stands in regard to compliance with federal and state regulations, identify any noncompliance, and subsequently implement a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to correct any identified noncompliance.

The LEAs determined to be highest risk within the applicable cohort for the monitoring year are selected for on-site monitoring. High risk status is determined from the compilation of multiple factors from all programs within the Department. Special Education Compliance looks at LEA’s performance in regard to the targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP), dispute resolution system data, and desk monitoring findings from the self-assessment.

On-site visits are coordinated with other federal programs when possible. Telephone monitoring and review of submitted documentation is used to expand the number of LEAs participating in the monitoring process.

The training and preparation level gives LEAs an opportunity to attend trainings on procedural compliance; review LEA policies, procedures, and practices; and to become familiar with the Special Education Standards and Indicators Manual to ensure procedural compliance. In addition, this level allows LEAs additional time to implement and assess any changes resulting from the previous desk review and/or on-site visit.

For special education compliance, CAPs are required for all identified noncompliance, and any findings of noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the LEA’s notification of the findings. In order to verify correction of noncompliance, additional data are requested as part of a follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance, and LEAs may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified. LEAs are expected to correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days, but in no case more than 12 months, of the receipt of the report of findings of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of IMACS and frequent contact with the LEAs by Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) compliance consultants and Department compliance

supervisors. LEAs are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months when they attend the required self-assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance.

Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS)

The OSE has a web-based general supervision management system: Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). The components of the system include compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through the Department's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by LEAs to submit required information to the OSE for both the cyclical and annual review processes. LEAs are encouraged to use IMACS on a voluntary basis for improvement planning, implementation, evaluation, and self monitoring.

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 the Department to track the issues identified to determine whether patterns or trends exist. Additionally, through the tracking of the issues over time, it is possible for the Department 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 is being offered as a pilot program in six school districts during the 2015- 2016 school year with statewide implementation in the 2016- 2017 school year. Four trained facilitators are available to provide facilitation during the pilot. Missouri Office of Special Education receives technical assistance from the CADRE, National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education, as a member of the IEP Facilitation Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup #2.

MONITORING FOR COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. A LEA may not use more than 15% of the amount the agency receives under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced by the agency under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through 1) the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER.

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with Department staff from the Special Education Compliance, Effective Practices, and Data Coordination sections. Upon review of LEA documentation, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE

As indicated above, the Department implements a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both 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 which cohort the LEA is assigned to, goes through the desk audit and application review level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, and final expenditure reports (FERs).

Only the applicable cohort for the fiscal year completes the self-assessment/desk monitoring level. This level of monitoring is completed through the web-based Tiered Monitoring System. The self-assessment/desk monitoring level serves as a tool for LEAs to determine where the LEA stands in regard to compliance with federal fiscal regulations, identify any deficiencies, and subsequently implement procedural changes to correct such deficiencies.

The LEAs determined to be highest risk within the applicable cohort for the fiscal year are selected for on-site monitoring. High risk status is determined from the compilation of multiple factors from all programs within the Department. Special Education Finance uses the following factors: late budget application, allocation amount, carry-over amount, late FER submission, A133 audit findings, cash management plan assignments, financial distress, failure to complete self-assessment as required during the prior year, and numerous desk monitoring findings from the self-assessment. On-site visits

are coordinated with other federal programs, when possible. Telephone monitoring and review of submitted documentation is used to expand the number of LEAs participating in the monitoring process. 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 the 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 and on-site monitoring levels, LEAs must correct deficiencies identified in CAPs.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

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 to assist the LEA in completing the desk review self-assessment checklist for compliance monitoring (see attachment under General Supervision) and fiscal compliance. Training is conducted in a variety of formats (face-to-face, webinars, Frequently Asked Questions [FAQ]) 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 (see Attachment) which will assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators 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 buildings and LEAs with identified noncompliance and/or low performance for students with disabilities (SWDs).

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 implementation of SW-PBS.
- Compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to LEAs to assist them with IDEA compliance requirements, compliance self-assessments, as well as writing and implementing CAPs.
- Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Collaborative Work (CW) consultants provide professional development, technical assistance and coaching to CW buildings/LEAs in collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making and effective teaching practices aligned with the CW.
- Professional Learning Community (PLC) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for PLC implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor building/LEA PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/LEAs in implementation of PLC.

These personnel at the RPDCs are collectively referred to as "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

Project ACCESS

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

Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs). Currently, there are 34 MACs and 591 IDACs serving LEAs throughout the state.

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 reflect Project ACCESS' philosophy toward education of children with ASD. BEAT coaches visit LEAs five to six times throughout the school year. The Coach collaborates with the IDAC along with other LEA staff to observe students, assist with assessments, model consultation strategies, and provide related coaching activities.

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): Since 1987, MSB has been providing MoSPIN, a statewide home-based program, to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired. MoSPIN provides direct, in-home parent education across the state 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, motor impairment, etc.). MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct service to the child. Parents choose to be active learners in this home-based program.

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:

- Regionally-based resource libraries
- 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 a deaf-related field such as deaf education, speech pathology, audiology, or ASL interpreting
- Audiology services
- Newborn hearing screening (required for all children)
- 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--workshops, in-service training, and informational presentations for LEAs, hospitals and clinics, and parent and community organizations.
- The Shared Reading Project--supports 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 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 training are designed to enhance teacher and LEA knowledge and skills to carry out the services to increase student achievement.

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) is the new format for the state alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The OSE developed a series of webinars that cover the basics of what educators need to know and do regarding DLM and the DLM manuals. The DESE website has numerous links to trainings and resources for educators who are administering the MAP-A. Additional training and technical assistance is provided by Improvement Consultants at each of the nine RPDCs.

MISSOURI SCHOOLWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS (MO SW-PBS) The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (MO SW-PBS) is to assist schools and LEAs in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

The MO SW-PBS initiative is supported by 35 personnel in the following positions:

- State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- Secondary/Tertiary Consultants
- Regional Consultants

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at the building, 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 Missouri University (MU) PBIS Center, both of which are supported by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

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. Support includes providing resources and information regarding special education law and process, assisting parents to plan for school meetings and/or 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 them in their work with families. The MPACT staff meets with the Mentors on a quarterly basis for additional updates and training.

COLLABORATIVE WORK (CW)

The Missouri Collaborative Work is an educational framework which emphasizes the use of collaborative teams and data based decision-making to support effective teaching and learning practices at the classroom level with the goal of improved outcomes for all students, especially students with disabilities.

Missouri Collaborative Work is focused on Visible Teaching and Learning. This work is informed by the research synthesis conducted by Dr. John Hattie and his continued work to create visible learning schools. This work is also informed by the Moving Your Numbers study conducted under the guidance of the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO). This work articulates the need for focusing on a few things using a systems approach. Their work clarified the need for alignment of state, regional, LEA, building and classroom efforts. Additional guidance was provided through the continued work of educational, implementation science, professional development, and coaching leaders (i.e. Robert Marzano, the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) Jim Knight, Richard Dufour, and others). The primary message of Dr. Hattie's work is "Know Thy Impact." Making teaching and learning visible in Missouri is building school-wide models in which teachers and students maintain a teacher/learner relationship characterized by the following:

- Teachers are passionate about teaching and learning and their passion is contagious with students.

- Teachers set learning intentions and success criteria aligned to Missouri Teaching/Learning Standards.
- Teachers use effective instructional practices, conduct frequent checks for understanding, and provide specific feedback.
- Students are taught how the learning intentions and success criteria are relevant and applicable, to articulate the extent to which learning has occurred, and identify needs for additional practice.

Implementation

Participating buildings commit to carrying-out the following activities, steps, and practices.

Commitment to Implementation Integrity

- Selection, mastery and implementation of a variety of effective instructional practices which have been proven to have a high effect on student outcomes
- Development and administration of common formative assessments (CFA) by grade-level and aligned to the Missouri Learning Standards of mathematics/English Language Arts at least five times annually.
- Efficient and effective Collaborative Data teams at the building level using classroom data to make instructional decisions
- Monthly reports of data analysis

Implementation Expectations

- All work will be aligned with the Missouri Learning Standards and Teacher/Leader Standards
- Building administrator will:
 - assure that the participation expectations and agreements have been shared with all instructional staff
 - assure that all instructional staff will be trained and participate on building collaborative data teams and provide support to instructional staff who have expertise in an effective teaching practice to coach and mentor colleagues
 - support and oversee the collaborative team process
 - new staff will be trained/mentored on the collaborative work
- All teachers (including Special Education and special subjects [music, art, physical education., etc] will actively participate on a collaborative teacher team
 - Small buildings may only have one team covering all grade levels.
 - Larger buildings may have two or more teams—some could have one per grade level.
- Each building will
 - identify a content area of English/language arts or mathematics to focus their attention and to report progress
 - select the “effective” teaching/learning practices for the year that all teachers will agree to use as part of the teaching/learning process.
- Each building level collaborative data team will
 - develop, administer, score and analyze results of grade appropriate common formative assessments aligned to a core academic standard.

Inclusion of students with IEPs in CFAs

It is expected that students with IEPs will participate in the grade-level CFAs just as they do other classroom assessments, either with or without accommodations indicated on their IEP. If a student is receiving all or most of their instruction in the general education classroom, then they should take the CFA.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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.

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-PBIS Consultants, PLC Consultants and CW 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 2012, the state was awarded a five-year SPDG. This SPDG is using lessons learned from the prior grant to begin implementing a more focused school improvement process (the Missouri Collaborative Work [CW]) with an emphasis on HQPD at the state, regional, LEA and building levels. The CW has four major areas of focus: Collaborative Data Teams, Effective Teaching/Learning Practices, Formative Assessment and Data-based Decision-making (see "Collaborative Work" above). During the 2012-13 school year, 270 buildings (mostly elementary buildings) volunteered to participate in the CW project. In 2013-14, 90 buildings were added for a total of 370, including middle and high schools. Professional development in the four focus areas has been developed and used to train state and regional PD providers who disseminate the information to staff in the identified buildings. Building staff form collaborative data teams that identify effective teaching/learning practices to implement in a selected area (English/language arts or math). All staff are trained in the practice. After training, staff develop and administer Common Formative Assessments to measure student progress and using a data team process, identify students for re-teaching and retesting. A cadre of State Implementation Specialists (SIS) have been trained and are evaluating the activities of the project to ensure that all activities meet standards of HQPD and are implemented with fidelity at all levels of the system to meet OSEP's standards for HQPD. The overall goal of this project is improved outcomes for all students, but especially for students with disabilities.

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

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 in their region. All regional consultants have access to the DLM online training system and have allocated regular blocks of time to completing all of the modules.

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 DROPOUT PROJECT

The Missouri Dropout Project is a coordinated evidence-based professional development system to assist high schools and feeder middle schools with developing, implementing, maintaining, evaluating and sustaining a comprehensive dropout prevention program for all students. It provides professional development training activities for schools in the areas of intervention, re-entry, recovery, re-engagement and reconnection. In addition it assists schools in the development of data collection systems to track students at risk of dropping out due to academic, behavioral and social emotional difficulties.

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 such to optimize successful start-up, purposeful innovation, scaling-up, and sustainability. Stages of implementation that are critical to successful implementation and resulting sustainability are:

- * exploration
- * initial implementation
- * full implementation
- * sustainability

Full implementation and sustainability involves a collaborative effort between parents, community members and educators working together to develop a culture of supporting youth with college and career competencies that lead to positive post-secondary outcomes.

ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM ACTIVITIES

See the following sections in "Technical Assistance" above for description of additional PD system activities:

- Project ACCESS
- MSB
- MSSD
- MSD
- MPACT

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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 OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The OSE solicits input from the SEAP in all areas related to the state's SSIP and the SPP/APR. The SEAP is dedicated to their involvement in discussions related to activities designed to improve compliance and student outcomes, targets to measure progress, and annual/trend data related to meeting the targets. To formalize these

discussions, the OSE annually schedules a comprehensive discussion of performance activities, targets for the year, and current/ trend progress data. Information is sent to the SEAP prior to the meeting to give them a chance to review materials and identify questions that remain. The process at the meeting involves an overview of the SPP/APR purposes and process (especially important for new members) followed by more detailed discussions of improvement activities, targets and progress. The Panel is encouraged to provide comments during the discussion phase but is also asked to discuss the activities, targets and progress in their small committee meetings. This model has proven to be effective especially for those members who are hesitant to speak in the large session. Most find their voices in the smaller committee groups.

The SEAP reviewed the SPP/APR at its December 4, 2015 meeting. Overall they were pleased with the results and thought the State was continuing to go in a positive direction. They approved a recommended change to the proficiency target for Indicator 3C mathematics as being necessary and consistent with other changes they had approved in the past.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Public Reporting of LEA Data
Public reports of 2014-15 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (the Department) Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal website. The Special Education Profiles are posted under Summary Reports (top right box of reports) at http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx . An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state.
Public Reporting of Statewide Data
The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MOProfile.pdf as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.
The SPP and APR documents are posted on the Department 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.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥									70.00%	71.50%
Data								68.60%	72.80%	73.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,858	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,783	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	75.27%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
5,858	7,783	73.36%	72.00%	75.27%

Graduation Conditions Field

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			4.70%	4.50%	4.30%	5.00%	4.90%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%
Data		5.60%	5.70%	5.70%	4.90%	5.00%	4.20%	4.10%	4.00%	2.92%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,209	39,194	2.92%	4.80%	3.08%

Use a different calculation methodology

Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Per OSEP, states are not required to report on Indicator 3A.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.30%	97.30%	99.64%	97.20%	99.70%	99.30%	99.40%	99.50%	99.54%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.30%	99.30%	99.57%	99.60%	99.60%	99.20%	99.40%	99.50%	99.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	62,869	62,794	99.54%	95.00%	99.88%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A	62,962	62,891	99.50%	95.00%	99.89%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Overall					

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple places:

State level data: http://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Special%20Education/Part%20B%20Federal%20Reporting/PartB_Assessment.pdf

State and LEA level data: <http://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx>

Select district.

In top right box select Special Education Profiles and go to page 6.

In bottom right box, select any of the options under Missouri Assessment Program, make dropdown selections (select All), click View Report.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			42.90%	51.00%	59.20%	67.40%	75.50%	56.20%	57.90%	23.20%
			Data		15.90%	17.60%	19.06%	23.58%	26.20%	27.00%	27.40%	25.80%	23.22%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			35.80%	45.00%	54.10%	63.30%	72.50%	56.40%	58.60%	26.40%
			Data		18.70%	20.90%	22.70%	25.82%	29.20%	29.60%	29.80%	28.40%	26.46%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	26.49%	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	17.32%	18.00%	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Due to new state assessments (Smarter Balance and DLM) and new standards for the 2014-15 school year, the state is resetting baseline to FFY 2014 and changing targets for mathematics for FFY2015 and future years. The FFY2014 targets were reset for reading and mathematics to equal the FFY2014 actual data since the baseline was reset.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	62,794	16,633	23.22%	26.49%	26.49%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	62,891	10,894	26.46%	17.32%	17.32%

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple places:

State level data: http://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Special%20Education/Part%20B%20Federal%20Reporting/PartB_Assessment.pdf

State and LEA level data: <http://mcids.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx>

Select district.

In top right box select Special Education Profiles and go to page 6.

In bottom right box, select any of the options under Missouri Assessment Program, make dropdown selections (select All), click View Report.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			1.50%	1.20%	1.00%	0.80%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	1.80%
Data		2.11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.20%	0.40%	0.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	537	0.19%	1.80%	0%

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- 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

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2013-14

school year, which is the data year for this indicator. In addition, the Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (<http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11>) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. 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 agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4A:

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

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

Missouri utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 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 district 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 sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

Using 2013-14 data, 27 LEAs met the minimum "n" size of at least 10 long-term out-of-school removals. Therefore, there were 510 (537-27 = 510) districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum "n" size. Of the 510 excluded, 340 reported no long-term out-of-school removals.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Data for all Local Education Agencies (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. Monitoring procedures specify that the first year a district meets the criteria to be identified as having a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, based on two consecutive years of data, the district is subject to a comprehensive review of policies, procedures and practices relating to discipline of students with

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

disabilities. The comprehensive review consists of a district self-assessment, student file reviews, and interviews with district staff to verify data. For each subsequent, consecutive year that a district's data indicates a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, the district will participate in a modified review. The modified review consists of a district self-assessment and interviews to verify data with district staff. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the district's discipline policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and 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. Should the district be identified for a period of five consecutive years, the year following the fifth year, the district will begin a new five year monitoring cycle and again be subject to a comprehensive review.

No LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy for this reporting period.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0.70%	1.60%	0.20%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	0	537	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2013-14 school year, which is the data year for this indicator. In addition, the Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (<http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11>) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. 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 agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4B:

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

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities 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 utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 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 district 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 sessions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident.

The following table provides the numbers of districts that were excluded from calculations due to not meeting the minimum "n" size of 10 long-term out-of-school removals.

4B: Discipline Summary Based on 2013-14 Data

	Black	White	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander
Total number of districts	537	537	537	537	537
Districts with ten or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	10	19	1	1	0
Districts excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum incident count (minimum "n" size=10)	527 (of which 474 had no reported incidents)	518 (of which 354 had no reported incidents)	536 (of which 508 had no reported incidents)	536 (of which 510 had no reported incidents)	537 (of which 531 had no reported incidents)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Data for all Local Education Agencies (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 for each race/ethnicity. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data. Monitoring procedures specify that the first year a district meets the criteria to be identified as having a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, based on two consecutive years of data, the district is subject to a comprehensive review of policies, procedures and practices. The comprehensive review consists of a district self-assessment, student file reviews, and interviews to verify data with district staff. For each subsequent, consecutive year that a district's data indicates a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, the district will receive a modified review. The modified review consists of a district self-assessment and interviews to verify data with district staff. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the district's discipline policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities, by race or ethnicity, and 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. Should the district be identified for a period of five consecutive years, the year following the fifth year, the district will begin a new five year monitoring cycle and again be subject to a comprehensive review.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2006	Target ≥			60.00%	59.00%	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%	59.50%	59.50%	56.00%
		Data		57.40%	55.80%	57.08%	58.00%	58.40%	58.60%	58.90%	58.10%	58.10%
B	2006	Target ≤			10.90%	10.80%	10.40%	10.30%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
		Data		11.20%	10.60%	10.01%	9.80%	9.60%	9.30%	9.40%	9.40%	9.11%
C	2006	Target ≤			3.45%	3.40%	3.60%	3.55%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.70%
		Data		3.70%	3.70%	3.72%	3.80%	3.70%	3.60%	3.60%	3.50%	3.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%
Target B ≤	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
Target C ≤	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.65%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	108,054	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,293	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,641	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	3,275	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	7	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	676	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,293	108,054	58.10%	56.00%	57.65%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,641	108,054	9.11%	10.20%	8.92%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,958	108,054	3.63%	3.70%	3.66%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									47.30%	29.00%
		Data								47.20%	47.20%	47.01%
B	2011	Target ≤									22.80%	32.00%
		Data								22.90%	22.90%	22.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	47.30%
Target B ≤	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	22.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,598	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	7,493	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,779	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	230	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,493	16,598	47.01%	30.00%	45.14%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,009	16,598	22.68%	31.00%	24.15%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						83.30%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.83%
		Data					92.60%	91.90%	93.90%	93.40%	94.10%	93.83%
A2	2013	Target ≥						49.90%	55.60%	55.60%	55.60%	48.10%
		Data					55.50%	53.50%	51.70%	52.90%	51.30%	48.10%
B1	2013	Target ≥						84.30%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.48%
		Data					93.70%	93.50%	95.60%	94.90%	96.60%	95.48%
B2	2013	Target ≥						38.10%	42.40%	42.40%	42.40%	40.51%
		Data					42.30%	42.10%	40.80%	43.50%	43.30%	40.51%
C1	2013	Target ≥						81.50%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.48%
		Data					90.60%	91.20%	93.00%	92.50%	93.90%	93.48%
C2	2013	Target ≥						54.50%	60.70%	60.70%	60.70%	56.79%
		Data					60.60%	59.40%	57.00%	58.50%	59.50%	56.79%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.90%
Target A2 ≥	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	48.20%
Target B1 ≥	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.50%
Target B2 ≥	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	40.60%
Target C1 ≥	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.50%
Target C2 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	56.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4986.00
------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	66.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	151.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2477.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1450.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	842.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3927.00	4144.00	93.83%	92.70%	94.76%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2292.00	4986.00	48.10%	45.00%	45.97%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	75.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	119.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2899.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1524.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	369.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4423.00	4617.00	95.48%	93.80%	95.80%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1893.00	4986.00	40.51%	37.00%	37.97%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	76.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	180.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2028.00

	Number of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1725.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	977.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3753.00	4009.00	93.48%	90.70%	93.61%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2702.00	4986.00	56.79%	53.00%	54.19%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No
 Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

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

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):

- ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been 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 of 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. ECSE staff will begin voluntary usage of the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year.
- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) is used to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at <http://dese.mo.gov/data-system-management/special-education-data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training>.
- The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department.
- Each eligible child entering ECSE must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least six months.
- No sampling is used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed.
- Entry and exit data must be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively.
- A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.”
- All entry and exit data collected during a given year must be submitted electronically to the Department at the end of that year.
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.
- More information can be obtained at <http://dese.mo.gov/data-system-management/special-education-data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Percentages for each of the outcome areas are as follows:

	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
a.	66	1.3%	75	1.5%	76	1.5%
b.	151	3.0%	119	2.4%	180	3.6%
c.	2477	49.7%	2899	58.1%	2028	40.7%
d.	1450	29.1%	1524	30.6%	1725	34.6%
e.	842	16.9%	369	7.4%	977	19.6%
Total	4986	100.0%	4986	100.0%	4986	100.0%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			77.00%	72.50%	75.00%	77.50%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	70.00%
Data		76.50%	69.40%	72.30%	69.60%	69.30%	71.40%	77.80%	77.60%	74.52%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3579.00	4865.00	74.52%	70.00%	73.57%

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.

The Department utilizes a single survey for all students with disabilities. Districts are instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of all students with disabilities which includes preschool students.

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 11% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

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

The 2015 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert

scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 178 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 assured an equal distribution of the districts in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium and small districts from urban, suburban and rural settings. Districts in each cohort also represent the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

The State does not collect demographic data on the parent survey, and therefore cannot determine if the actual respondents are *demographically* representative of the state. The decision to not include demographic data on the survey was based on advice of contracted statisticians, with the thought that collecting demographic info would negatively impact the response rate due to parent concerns of their responses being identifiable by the demographic variables. This is of particular concern in small districts, of which there are many in the state of Missouri. For the 2015-16 school year, there are 263 LEAs with a K-12 enrollment of less than 500 students, and 390 with an enrollment less than 1000. Also factoring into the decision to not include demographic information on the survey is the fact that many LEAs in the state, especially the smaller districts, are racially and ethnically homogeneous.

The monitoring cohort surveyed during the 2014-15 school year included 178 school districts. Responses were received from 162 districts (91.0% response rate), which represented approximately 89% of the students with disabilities in the cohort's districts. A total of 4,902 surveys were completed, 57% by mail and 43% electronically. The return rate for the 2014-15 data was 14.1% which was a 2.6% increase over the prior year. The mean district response rate was 24%; the median district response rate was 18%. Of the 16 districts that did not have any survey responses, nine had fewer than 50 students with disabilities.

The following table shows the racial/ethnic distribution of K-12 enrollment in the state, the LEAs in the monitoring cohort surveyed in the 2014-15 school year, and the LEAs in the monitoring cohort that had survey responses. The table shows similar demographics across the three sets of LEAs.

	White	Black	Hispanic	Multi-racial	Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander
State	72.8%	16.2%	5.6%	2.9%	1.9%	0.4%	0.2%
LEAs Surveyed	74.2%	13.5%	6.9%	2.9%	1.5%	0.5%	0.3%
LEAs with Survey Responses	75.3%	12.2%	7.2%	3.0%	1.4%	0.6%	0.4%

The assumption is that if the state is surveying districts that are representative of the state, and that responses are obtained from a large percentage of the districts representing a large percentage of the students with disabilities, then the probability is high that the responses will also be representative of the state.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	534	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2014-15 school year. The Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (<http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11>) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. 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 agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the “special school district” itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

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

Using a cell size (“n” size) of 20 students with disabilities for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of LEAs, the following numbers of LEAs were examined for disproportionate representation:

- White: 105
- Black: 55
- Hispanic: 45
- Asian: 9
- Native American: 4
- Pacific Islander: 0
- Multi-racial: 27

A total of 109 districts had the minimum “n” size for one or more racial/ethnic groups. This resulted in 425 (534 – 109) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3	1	534	0%	0%	0.19%

Explanation of Slippage

During a comprehensive review, noncompliance in evaluation and identification procedures and practices was found in one district resulting in disproportionate representation of African American students with intellectual disabilities. Corrective action has been ordered.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2014-15 school year. The Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (<http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11>) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. 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 agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

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

The following table provides the number of districts included and excluded from calculations due to the minimum "n" size requirements:

Disproportionate Representation Districts Examined

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	Multi Racial	Unduplicated Districts Included	Unduplicated Districts Excluded
SLD	40	30	19	1	0	0	4	41	493
Autism	19	9	4	1	0	0	1	19	515
Sp/Lang	40	21	15	2	0	0	5	41	493
ED	14	10	1	0	0	0	3	15	519
ID	20	16	4	1	0	0	1	21	513
OHI	32	26	5	1	0	0	3	32	502

Based on the table above, 49 districts were evaluated for one or more disability and race/ethnicity combinations. This resulted in 485 (534-49) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

Once an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE is required to review the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Based upon consecutive years of identification, the reviews occur across a 5-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a comprehensive review is required. The second through fifth consecutive years an LEA is identified, a modified review is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the fifth year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a comprehensive review starting a new monitoring cycle. The comprehensive review is comprised of a self-assessment, student file reviews, and staff interviews. The modified review is comprised of a self-assessment and interviews. Whether a comprehensive or modified review takes place, no onsite visit is typically conducted; however, at any point in the process, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary.

The three districts identified through data analysis as having disproportionate representation were reviewed using monitoring procedures described in the previous paragraph. In two of the three districts, policies, procedures and practices were found not to result in inappropriate identification. In the third district, a monitoring review found practices and procedures which resulted in inappropriate identification. In this district, due to consecutive identification of disproportionate representation of black students identified in the disability category of intellectual disability for multiple years, the Office of Special Education (OSE) determined an onsite visit was warranted in addition to the standard monitoring review process. Additionally, the OSE determined that a broader review of student files was needed. The standard disproportionate representation review process consists of a comparison of five student files of

the identified racial/ethnic group and disability category to five files of students in the non-identified racial/ethnic group and disability category found eligible in the last two years. In the case of this district's review, it was determined that all initial evaluation files of students identified as having an intellectual disability over the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years would be reviewed. Additionally, these same student files were submitted to the OSE and reviewed internally by OSE Compliance staff to verify results of the onsite student file review. Interviews were also conducted with district- and building-level teachers and administrative staff regarding evaluation and identification policies, practices and procedures. The final results of the review process indicated inappropriate identification of black students identified as having an intellectual disability due to evaluation practices and procedures. The district was issued a final report of the review with a Corrective Action Plan. In addition, a follow-up visit with the LEA will be conducted to discuss specific issues found in the review, provide technical assistance, and work with the district to develop a plan which will enable the district to correct their policies and procedures in a timely manner, and in no case more than twelve months from the date of their final report, and to ultimately resolve any issues which might contribute to future identification of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification of black students under the disability category of intellectual disability.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.70%	94.00%	97.08%	97.80%	96.80%	97.80%	97.90%	97.60%	98.99%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
6,745	6,608	98.99%	100%	97.97%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	137
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Explanation of Slippage

The amount of slippage is minimal from FFY2013 to FFY2014 at 1.02 percent and the compliance rate remains very high for the state. When comparing the findings for the same cohort districts 3 years prior (FFY11) during the previous review cycle the results actually indicate a slight increase of .07 percent.

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 137 children ranged from two days to 115 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 districts were cited for noncompliance with the timelines. A small number of delays were due to staff not being available to complete the 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 used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

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

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

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

The data are gathered in the web-based IMACS. Districts enter the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

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

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

The file review process includes checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts include initial evaluation timelines which are not within 60-days, the following criteria are accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Delays are considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions do not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the districts fail to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
166	166	0	0

FFY 2013 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 2012 (2012-13) APR. Data reflecting the 2012-13 school year, and reported in the FFY 2012 (2012-13) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2013, which is FFY 2013.

In FFY2013, there were 166 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 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 37 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 FFY2013, there were 166 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 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 37 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 166 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

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.40%	80.30%	88.60%	91.30%	95.00%	96.60%	95.50%	93.90%	98.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	478
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	55
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	399
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.	4
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	399	418	98.83%	100%	95.45%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	19
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Explanation of Slippage

The slippage represents a low number of students for FFY14 (nineteen children from eleven districts). The compliance rate remains high for the state. When comparing the findings for the same cohort districts 3 years prior (FFY11) during the previous review cycle the results indicate only a slight decrease of 0.05 percent.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday

when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

For the nineteen children for whom the IEP was not developed by the third birthday, the delays ranged from three days to 124 days. All but one delay were 30 days or less. The child with the 124 day delay was actually continuing to receive Part C services during the summer months after his third birthday, and then transitioned to early childhood special education services when school started in the fall. Therefore, there was no delay or gap in services for the child. Reasons for the other delays included late referrals from Part C and parent delays in scheduling meetings. The nineteen children were from eleven districts.

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

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

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

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for Part C to Part B transition, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report this information. The special education monitoring cycle is part of the Federal Tiered Monitoring Review three-year cohort process. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their Tiered Monitoring Review year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes districts in all regions of the state.

Data for 2014-15 were gathered in the web-based IMACS which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible? (Y/N)
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason Y/N

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	0	0

FFY 2013 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 2012 (2012-13) APR. Data reflecting the 2012-13 school year, and reported in the FFY 2012 (2012-13) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2013, which is FFY 2013.

In FFY 2013, there were 25 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 12 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 12 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 2013, there were 25 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 12 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 12 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 25 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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						91.30%	79.40%	82.30%	87.50%	88.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
628	709	88.63%	100%	88.58%

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

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

Describe the method used to 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 districts to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

Districts complete a file review on transition age students and answer the following questions for each student:

- Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?
- Are there 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?
- Is there 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?
- Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?
- Do 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?
- Were the transition services developed considering the individual child’s needs, preferences, and interests?
- Is there evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed?

Compliance supervisors review and verify district documentation based on the above standards. Districts identified with noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Documentation of correction is submitted for review and verification. Onsite reviews may be conducted based on performance data and focused areas for review.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
106	106	0	0

FFY 2013 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 2012 (2012-13) APR. Data reflecting the 2012-13 school year, and reported in the FFY 2012 (2012-13) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2013, which is FFY 2013.

In FFY 2013, there were 106 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 65 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 65 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 2013, there were 106 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 65 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 65 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 106 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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
		Data						23.38%	30.20%	31.60%	29.20%	29.13%
B	2009	Target ≥							46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
		Data						45.94%	53.10%	54.30%	53.50%	55.62%
C	2009	Target ≥							51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%
		Data						50.33%	58.60%	59.70%	57.70%	60.58%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
Target B ≥	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
Target C ≥	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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	7352.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2281.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2093.00
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)	261.00
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).	128.00

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2281.00	7352.00	29.13%	24.40%	31.03%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4374.00	7352.00	55.62%	46.90%	59.49%
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)	4763.00	7352.00	60.58%	51.30%	64.79%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			50.00%	35.00%	35.10%	35.20%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data		46.90%	46.20%	48.80%	44.00%	55.20%	19.61%	44.12%	41.03%	37.84%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	16	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	36	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
16	36	37.84%	35.30%	44.44%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			62.50%	35.00%	35.10%	35.20%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data		66.70%	55.50%	64.70%	81.30%	90.00%	95.30%	72.00%	94.29%	90.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	26	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	32	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	26	32	90.00%	35.30%	87.50%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		18.40%
Data	17.40%	24.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
 Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	19.40%	20.90%	22.40%	23.90%

Key:

Description of Measure

Missouri's State Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) for students with disabilities is focused on improving proficiency outcomes in the areas of English/language Arts and mathematics. Approximately 310 schools are voluntarily participating in a multi-year pilot project to validate the selected effective practices. This pilot initiative is called the Collaborative Work. Our SIMR is based on the outcomes for these 310 schools, and we will scale the process if this pilot process produces anticipated results. Missouri's SIMR, therefore, is to increase the percent of students with disabilities in tested grades who will perform at proficiency levels on state assessments (excluding alternate assessments) in English/Language Arts and mathematics in the Collaborative Work pilot schools by 6.5 percentage points by 2018.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

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

See uploaded document.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See uploaded document.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

See uploaded document.

Description

See uploaded document.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

See uploaded document.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.