Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART C
2011-12

Submitted January 29, 2013
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report: 3

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. 5

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. 9

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: 11
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: 16
A. Know their rights;
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
C. Help their children develop and learn.

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. 20

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. 22

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline 23

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: 26
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 31

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. 36

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. 37

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). 38

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 39

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 40

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) is the lead State agency for Part C of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention program, First Steps, is operated through contractual agreements in ten regions across the State and a contracted Central Finance Office (CFO). The ten regional offices are known as System Points of Entry (SPOEs) and they provide service coordination, evaluation and eligibility determination, as well as all local administrative activities for the program. The State contracts with a single entity in each region to fulfill the SPOE functions. Independent providers enroll with the CFO and provide direct services to children and families as directed by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

This Annual Performance Report (APR) covers federal fiscal year 2011, which is the State fiscal year 2012 (July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012). The time period covered by this report is referred to as "2011-2012" to eliminate confusion due to the differing State and federal fiscal year terminology.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This APR was developed with review and input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the SPOEs, as was the State Performance Plan (SPP). On December 28, 2012, the SPOE contractors and the SICC received a draft of the SPP/APR documents. These groups were asked to provide feedback to the Department so that recommendations could be considered and incorporated into the final document prior to the scheduled review of the final draft at the January 11, 2013 SICC meeting. At this meeting, the SICC approved the report and accepted it as their annual report. The SICC Certification of the APR is available at http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html.

Public Dissemination and Reporting: Missouri's SPP and APR are available for public viewing on the Department website at http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html. This webpage also provides a link to the public reporting by SPOE. These forms of reporting allow the public to review the State's SPP targets and be aware of any progress/slippage at the State and local levels.

In addition to the annual reporting of the APR, the Office of Special Education reports annually to the regional SPOE offices and the SICC on progress/slippage made across the State during the previous year on meeting the State's targets as addressed in the SPP. During these discussions, indicators are examined and evaluated related to the Improvement Activities described in the SPP. Data are tracked and reviewed periodically during the year to identify current trends that may require immediate technical assistance to individual regions within the State. The SICC certifies this APR report as their annual report to the Governor and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

Monitoring Procedures: The ten SPOEs are divided into two sets of five for monitoring purposes. Each set of five SPOEs is representative of the State as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar. Each set of SPOEs receives a compliance review every other year.

The monitoring data reported in this APR were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures, which includes desk reviews of individual child records, SPOE staff interviews and/or onsite reviews. For each Service Coordinator in each of the five SPOE regions, two randomly selected files were reviewed for children active in fiscal year 2011-12. The number of Service Coordinators included in the review ranged from six in the smallest SPOE region to 24 in the largest SPOE region.

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the State ensures that each SPOE agency with noncompliance identified from any source: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieve 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Corrective Action Plans are required for all identified noncompliance and all noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but within 12 months of the SPOE agency's notification of the findings. To verify the correction of noncompliance, State staff request additional data as part of the follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and SPOEs may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction has been verified.

DRAFT

Individual Corrective Action Plans are required for all findings of individual child noncompliance and are expected to be corrected at 100% within 60 days, but must be corrected within 12 months from the date of notification of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of the program. State staff request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed through various communications about sanctions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual agreement, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is considered out of compliance and subject to sanctions per the contract standards.

Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities: The Office of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Office of Special Education staff in a model for evaluating Improvement Activities. In 2011-12, the model was revised with the assistance of the NCRRC in order to further analyze improvement activities. Using the updated model, Office of Special Education staff continue to review and revise existing Improvement Activities, align those activities with relevant contractual activities, and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for those activities. Revisions to the Improvement Activities are reflected in the SPP/APR. The Office of Special Education will continue to collaborate with the NCRRC and work on the evaluation of Improvement Activities in 2012-13.

Regional Technical Assistance: The Department employs five Area Directors to work as a program unit within the field. Each Area Director provides direction, training and problem solving for two contiguous SPOE regions. The Area Directors also function as the statewide technical assistance resource for the program which enables the lead agency to provide a consistent message to the early intervention community. The Area Directors are supervised by the coordinator of the First Steps Program, who is employed by the Department.

Transdisciplinary Teams: The Area Directors are an integral part of the movement toward Early Intervention Teams, Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. In 2011-12, SPOEs met their contractual requirement to implement the team model for at least 50 percent of new families. In 2012-13, the SPOE contract requires 100 percent of new families be assigned to a team. The Area Directors provide initial guidance and instruction to regional SPOE offices and providers and will provide continued mentoring to teams as Missouri achieves statewide implementation.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner

DRAFT

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 81.6%, Missouri did not meet the target for this indicator.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

Data reported below based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State (see Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (within 30 days of parent consent)	46	61	**47**
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who have acceptable reasons for the delay in initiation of early intervention services*	17	14	**15**
Subtotal - Number of infants and toddlers who receive all IFSP services within 30 days or with acceptable reasons*	63	75	**62**
Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	72	82	**76**
Percent of infants and toddler with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner*	87.5%	91.5%	**81.6%**

* Both the infants and toddlers receiving all services within 30 days (numerator) and the total infants and toddlers receiving IFSP services (denominator) include children whose delays in initiation of services were due to exceptional family circumstances.

In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service was provided.

In 2011-12, a total of 76 records were reviewed for timely services. Of the 76 records, 29 had delayed services resulting in 15 with acceptable reasons and 14 with unacceptable reasons.

Acceptable reasons for untimely services include: Authorization/Billing Issue, Parent/Child Delay, and IFSP Team Decision. An Authorization/Billing issue indicates the service actually did begin within 30 days, but an issue with the entry of an authorization or the provider's billing for the service made it appear as though the service did not start within 30 days. A Parent/Child Delay indicates exceptional family circumstances (e.g., child illness/hospitalization, family vacation, and unable to locate family). An IFSP Team Decision indicates the IFSP Team decided the initiation of services should not commence within the first 30 days after the team meeting.

Unacceptable reasons for untimely services include: Provider Delay, Service Coordinator Delay, and No Provider Available. A Provider Delay indicates the provider was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A Service Coordinator Delay indicates the Service Coordinator was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A No Provider Available indicates no provider could be located to provide a service.

When at least one service on the child's IFSP was untimely due to an unacceptable reason, the child was included under **Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services**. The table below shows the distribution of reasons for untimely services.

Acceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	**Number**
Authorization/Billing Issue (no actual delay in provision of services)	**2**
Parent/Child Delay (exceptional family circumstances)	**9**
IFSP Team Decision	**4**
Total	**15**
Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	**Number**
Provider Delay	**11**
Service Coordinator Delay	**1**
No Provider Available	**2**
Total	**14**

DRAFT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance and slippage from the previous year is reported.

Upon analysis of the 14 unacceptable reasons for untimely services, it was determined the actual delay in the initiation of services ranged from 2 to 132 days beyond the 30-day threshold. Of the 14 unacceptable reasons, it was determined one SPOE region accounted for 10 of the 14 unacceptable delays (or 71% of the unacceptable reasons). Under the corrective action plan for this region, the Area Director will provide training and technical assistance on timely services.

Upon further analysis, it was determined 13 of the 14 unacceptable reasons were due to provider delays or no provider available. In further analysis of these 13 reasons, it was determined 9 of the 13 unacceptable reasons involved physical therapy or speech/language pathology (or 69% of the unacceptable reasons). Thus the State determined slippage in timely services was due to provider delays or provider unavailability; however, there were no other patterns in the service type or service area for the untimely provision of services.

In addition to an analysis of the reasons, a closer look at the total number of services initiated within the 76 records found 135 services were initiated during 2011-12. Of the 135 services, 121 (89.6%) were

provided in a timely manner or had an acceptable reason for initiating the services beyond 30 days. This analysis indicated that, when looking at the total number of services in comparison to the number of children, the percentage fared higher than what was reported in this indicator.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 include the following:

- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators and providers on initiating timely IFSP services through a Transdisciplinary Team Approach
- Provide materials for Service Coordinators and providers to clarify policies/procedures related to initiation of services after initial IFSP decisions

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Transdisciplinary Team Approach: Missouri is moving toward a statewide transdisciplinary model of service delivery, Early Intervention Teams (EIT), which includes the use of a Routines-Based Interview™ and a primary provider approach to service delivery. Much of fiscal year 2012 was spent on continued implementation of the model and provider training. With the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, the State developed four levels of training for providers who participate on teams. All four levels of training were disseminated in 2010 through 2012. The final level of training will be developed in fiscal year 2013.

In February 2012, a new online module on early intervention teaming was released to the public in order to provide basic information about working as a team. While this module is not required for all providers, the SPOE regions may require the training before a provider is placed on a team. The First Steps Area Directors continue to support the development and training of teams across the State.

As indicated in the SPOE contracts awarded in fiscal year 2009 and implemented July 1, 2009, SPOE agencies were to begin to implement teams in each SPOE region as of July 1, 2010. Each SPOE agency met their contract requirement of at least 50 percent of new families assigned to teams in fiscal year 2012.

In June of each year, the State holds a SPOE contractor meeting with all SPOE directors and lead service coordinators in attendance. The purpose of the meeting is to reiterate early intervention rules and best practices in service delivery. In addition to the June meeting, ongoing discussions about progress and challenges to implementing EIT occurred at the quarterly SPOE meetings September 2011 and April 2012.

Review/Revise Materials: The First Steps guidance on timely services indicates acceptable and unacceptable reasons for a delay in service delivery. Reasons include 1) parent/child reason for delay, 2) Service Coordinator reason for delay, 3) team decision to delay services, 4) provider delay, and 5) authorization/billing issue. The State uses a web-based child data and IFSP system, referred to as WebSPOE, to capture provider authorizations, provider progress notes and claims for service delivery. The WebSPOE prompts Service Coordinators to review provider progress notes each month via a monthly reminder for new provider progress notes that have not been reviewed.

The First Steps Area Directors reviewed written guidance on timely services that outlined the definitions of the five reasons for delay and how Service Coordinators would review provider progress notes to ensure timely services are delivered. A Provider Service Request Form was developed in 2010-11 for statewide use to help Service Coordinators and providers keep track of evaluation and service deadlines. The State modified the WebSPOE system in 2011-12 to include an electronic version of this request form. The First Steps Area Directors continue to provide technical assistance regarding the provision of services in a timely manner.

An annual First Steps newsletter for providers is developed and disseminated to the public each spring. The 2012 newsletter included an article on the results of the Annual Performance Report indicator 1: Timely Services and provider suggestions for delivering services in a timely manner to children and families.

To ensure that First Steps providers maintain adequate documentation for services delivered, the Missouri service provider agreement was revised and released in February 2012. All First Steps providers

DRAFT

were required to review and sign the updated service provider agreement by June 2012 or the provider could no longer deliver services in Missouri until a signed agreement was on file.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: Findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11 based on results from the review of 2009-10 records. To verify correction of noncompliance, two additional files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of additional data; and (2) initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	95.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 98.9%, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Primary Setting for children under 3 years of age with active IFSPs*	12/1/2009	%	12/1/2010	%	12/1/2011	%
Home	3,923	93.4%	4,305	94.8%	4,765	94.8%
Community-based Setting	200	4.8%	186	4.1%	204	4.1%
Total	4,123	**98.2%**	4,491	**98.9%**	4,969	**98.9%**
Program Designed for Children with Developmental Delay or Disabilities	64	1.5%	43	1.0%	39	1.0%
Service Provider Location	3	0.1%	1	0.0%	5	0.0%
Hospital (Inpatient)	4	0.1%	4	0.1%	2	0.0%
Other Setting	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	8	0.1%
Residential Facility	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
Total Other	77	1.8%	48	1.1%	55	1.1%
Total	4,200	100.0%	4,539	100.0%	5,024	100.0%

*Data based on 618 Table 2

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

The State maintained performance at 98.9% for both 2010-11 and 2011-12. The State continues to show a very high percentage of children receiving services in the natural environment.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs identified through evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve/maintain performance on this indicator
- Implement IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS) to assess IFSP quality

DRAFT

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Targeted Technical Assistance: Data reports are posted monthly to the Department's website. Data on primary setting for direct services are reviewed by the First Steps Area Directors on a quarterly basis. As a result of quarterly data reviews, the State determined a majority of services were provided in the natural environment throughout 2011-12. In the event that less than 95% of children were being served outside of the natural environment, the Area Directors provided technical assistance on natural environment settings to the identified SPOE.

In 2011-12, the Area Directors disseminated two trainings throughout the SPOE regions to support services in natural environments: (1) Early Intervention Teams Level III - Conducting the Routines Based Interview and (2) Early Intervention Teams Level IV- Quality Home Visiting Practices- Adult Learning Styles and Coaching. In February 2012, five existing online training modules were updated and released to the public in order to provide basic information about First Steps. The updates included new information on services in the natural environments. Additionally a new online training module was added to provide basic information on services delivered through a Transdisciplinary Team Approach.

IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale: During 2011-12, the IFSP QIRS process was revised by State staff in conjunction with nationally recognized early childhood experts to provide a "quality" evaluation instrument used to evaluate IFSPs. All QIRS training materials, including a manual and handouts, are posted on the Office of Special Education website at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/QualityIndicatorScale.html.

In order to ensure that IFSP teams are making individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, the Area Directors conduct a QIRS scoring process that includes the review of any natural environment justification statements in the event that services are provided outside of the natural environment.

The SPOE contract requires each region receive an overall score on the QIRS review in the "acceptable" to "high quality" range or liquidated damages will be applied to the next year's contract. For 2011-12, each of the SPOE regions reviewed received ratings at the acceptable or quality level; therefore, no penalty was applied to the contract renewal for 2011-12 based on the QIRS review.

The Area Directors review the QIRS results with each SPOE agency and hold training activities targeted to continue strengthening the quality of IFSP development. These efforts are intended to ensure all children and families receive high quality intervention services through the First Steps program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

One Improvement Activity has been revised in the State Performance Plan to reflect changes in the State's procedures.

This change was presented and approved by the SICC on January 11, 2013.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement: Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

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

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

DRAFT

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
2011-12	**Outcome Areas**	**A: Positive social-emotional skills**	**B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills**	**C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**
	Summary Statement 1	69.2%	70.4%	73.1%
	Summary Statement 2	47.5%	45.6%	36.2%

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

Missouri met all targets for Summary Statement 1 but did not meet all targets for Summary Statement 2.

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	54	2.2%	57	2.3%	69	2.8%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	449	18.2%	425	17.2%	408	16.5%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	894	36.1%	970	39.2%	1,176	47.6%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	587	23.7%	634	25.6%	531	21.5%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	489	19.8%	387	15.7%	289	11.6%
Total	2,473	100.0%	2,473	100.0%	2,473	100.0%

DRAFT

Summary Statements:

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	74.6%	76.9%	78.2%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited	43.5%	41.3%	33.2%

Definition of "comparable to same-aged peers": Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the First Steps 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):

- Each eligible child entering First Steps or Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months
- First Steps and ECSE must use three sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. While First Steps personnel are not required to use a specific assessment instrument, personnel determine the appropriate tool(s) to collect assessment results for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been compiled at this time. In 2011-12, a review of available instruments for collecting First Steps entry and exit data was completed and it was determined that a pilot for new data collection procedures to embed the ECO collection in the IFSP process would be conducted in 2012-13
- In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C APR. This form is currently used by all local programs and can be viewed at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department
- Entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely"
- Since February 2011, all First Steps entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system known as WebSPOE and the State analyzes the data at the end of each fiscal year. The reporting year for 2011-12 is the first full year that all ECO data for this indicator were pulled from the WebSPOE instead of a manual tracking form
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings

DRAFT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

Missouri met the targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas. While Missouri did not meet targets for Summary Statement 2 for any of the outcome areas, improvement was noted for two of the indicators: Indicator a) progress in Summary Statement 2 was noted from 41.0% in 2010-11 to 43.5% in 2011-12 and Indicator c) progress in Summary Statement 2 was noted from 32.5% in 2010-11 to 33.2% in 2011-12.

An analysis of the data shows children who enter First Steps below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exited as reflected in Summary Statement 1; however, children are not necessarily functioning at age expectation by the time they exited as reflected in Summary Statement 2. This analysis is indicative of the State's eligibility criteria, since Missouri has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age developmental delay and does not serve at-risk children.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children continue to be eligible and receive services in Part B, ECSE. Data from the Part B program show that children receiving services in ECSE continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes. (See Part B APR, Indicator 7).

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide ECO training through periodic face-to-face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes
- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers using the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data

- Provide targeted technical assistance to agencies identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting State targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Training: All ECO training materials, including a video presentation, handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at: http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html. All materials are accessible to the general public; however, the video presentation requires registration prior to access. In 2010-11, the first year that registration for the video presentation was required, 21 registrants from higher education, early intervention and other professions accessed the module. In 2011-12, the number of registrants accessing the module increased to 24 from public schools, higher education, early intervention and other professions. Although the number of registrants increased slightly, the number is a low representation of professionals working in the First Steps and ECSE programs. The State is considering revisions to the training materials and access to the video presentation for 2012-13.

First Steps and ECSE personnel receive regular reminders through Listserv messages regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training for staff who will be administering the assessment and the timely and accurate reporting of the data.

In addition to the online materials, the Area Directors delivered training to each SPOE region in 2011-12 on developing a quality IFSP and what constitutes a functional outcome that is meaningful across multiple settings and times of the day.

DRAFT

Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO Data: In 2011-12, all First Steps entry and exit data were entered into WebSPOE instead of a manual process of collecting data on spreadsheets. As a result of moving to the electronic system, which includes the MOSIS ID numbers, the State is better able to match data between the First Steps and ECSE programs.

In previous years, State staff found First Steps personnel were reporting data primarily via parent input while ECSE personnel were reporting data primarily via assessment results. The State then modified the data collection procedures for ECO so all First Steps and ECSE ratings must include three sources of information: parent input, professional observation and assessment results. The State encourages First Steps and ECSE personnel to collaborate in the assignment of a First Steps exit rating in order for the ECSE entry rating to be the same.

For the past three years, State staff performed cross checks to determine the number of First Steps exit ratings that matched the ECSE entry ratings. Cross checks revealed that matching First Steps exit and ECSE entry ratings remained at approximately 30-35% of children; however, data also showed the match rate varied across SPOE regions. Upon further analysis of the First Steps data within the matching ratings, it was determined the number of children with matching ratings increased in three SPOE regions, stayed the same in one SPOE region and decreased in the remaining six regions. The Area Directors plan to provide targeted technical assistance to all regions regarding the ECO rating procedures and incorporate ECO analysis into regular data reviews in 2012-13.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: When requested by SPOE personnel, the Area Directors provide technical assistance on ECO by fielding questions and attending staff meetings. Technical assistance regarding the determination of ECO ratings and the data collection process will continue in 2012-13, as needed.

Ongoing discussions and meetings about ECO procedures occur regularly throughout SPOE regions. On September 15, 2011, a statewide meeting took place with personnel from all SPOE regions in attendance. The meeting included a targeted review of regional entry and exit data with a discussion about the age, duration and conditions of children that impact the scores. Additionally, SPOE personnel conducted an informal needs assessment as a review of the procedures utilized in their respective regions. The results of this discussion revealed the need to consider more data collection points than just entry and exit as well as the need to consider alternate data collection instruments and procedures. Following this discussion, State staff met with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in April 2012 to review the current policies and procedures utilized by the State and consider alternatives for

collecting and reporting ECO entry and exit ratings. The result of this meeting was for the State to research other State's policies and procedures as well as the national resources through the ECO Center and develop a proposal for a pilot to be conducted in 2012-13.

State staff attended the 2011 national conference on Measuring & Improving Child & Family Outcomes in order to review the procedures utilized in other States and to review the national materials regarding ECO policies. Information from the national conference led to the State's consideration to modify the ECO collection procedures and a possible pilot project in 2012-13 to utilize several national resources obtained from the conference.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 in the FFY 2011 APR.

Department Response: The State has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 in this APR.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

DRAFT

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	4A, 4B, 4C: 95% of parents will agree or strongly agree with the survey items

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 96.2%, 97.2% and 98.0% agreement, respectively, Missouri met the targets for this indicator.

Survey Instrument: The complete family survey can be found at http://www.dese.mo.gov/se/fs/documents/2012CFOSurvey.pdf.

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

Several conclusions were drawn from analyzing the 2007 data from the split survey design:

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

For 2011-12, the census methodology was utilized and surveys were mailed to all families with a child in active IFSP status. If a family had more than one child in First Steps, the family received more than one survey. The response rate for 2011-2012 was 20.8% which was a slight decrease from the previous year of 22.8%. An analysis of responses by SPOE indicates the response rates are comparable across the State. For results from previous years, see: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html#OtherReports.

Family Survey Data

A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights

Q10. I received information and explanations about our family's rights to file a child complaint.

Response	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012		
Strongly Agree	94.1%	95.1%	598	58.7%	**94.4%***
Agree			364	35.7%	
Disagree	5.9%	4.9%	42	4.1%	**5.6%**
Strongly Disagree			15	1.5%	

Q11. I received information and explanations about our family's parental rights.

Response	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012		
Strongly Agree	98.1%	98.4%	635	60.7%	**97.9%***
Agree			389	37.2%	
Disagree	1.9%	1.6%	20	1.9%	**2.1%**
Strongly Disagree			2	0.2%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4A: Average of 94.4% and 97.9% = 96.2%**

B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs

Q24. Since being part of First Steps, I can work with professionals.

Response	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012		
Strongly Agree	98.1%	98.1%	553	59.6%	**98.2%***
Agree			358	38.6%	
Disagree	1.9%	1.9%	16	1.7%	**1.8%**
Strongly Disagree			1	0.1%	

Q25. Since being part of First Steps, I know how to advocate for what my child needs.

Response	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012		
Strongly Agree	97.2%	96.3%	560	56.9%	**96.2%***
Agree			387	39.3%	
Disagree	2.8%	3.7%	33	3.4%	**3.8%**
Strongly Disagree			4	0.4%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4B: Average of 98.2% and 96.2% = 97.2%**

C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn

Q19. First Steps services give my family the tools to directly improve my child's development.

Response	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012		
Strongly Agree	98.5%	97.7%	665	64.3%	**98.0%***
Agree			349	33.7%	
Disagree	1.5%	2.3%	16	1.5%	**2.0%**
Strongly Disagree			5	0.5%	

***Affirmative response for question related to Indicator 4C: 98.0%**

DRAFT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

The State met the 2011-12 targets for indicators 4A, 4B and 4C, with family survey data indicating 96.2%, 97.2% and 98.0% agreement, respectively.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Support Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families
- Plan for the development of a First Steps family mentor program
- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators based on results of First Steps family survey

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Training, Resources and Materials to Families: MPACT was contracted to disseminate the *Steps to Success* training series in 2011-12. The series provides information to families on how to work effectively with teams, understand the early intervention process and understand their rights. The series also provides professionals with an understanding of the First Steps program. The following modules are included in the series: Understanding the IFSP Process, Communicating Effectively with Your IFSP Team, First Steps Parental Rights, and Transition from C to B. During 2011-12, MPACT developed Record Keeping for Families as the fifth module of the series. Implementation of the series in 2011-12 included dissemination to MPACT staff and MPACT Parent Mentors to ensure their understanding of the First Steps program.

During 2011-12, trainings from the *Steps for Success* series were conducted for parents and agency personnel (including First Steps, Head Start, ECSE and MPACT staff) in locations across the State. The training schedule included the following:

- Two trainings on *Understanding First Steps Parental Rights*
- Two trainings on *Communicating Effectively*
- Six trainings on *Transition Part C to B*
- One training on *Recordkeeping for Families*

In addition, three *Steps to Success* trainings are available online at the MPACT website: *Effectively Communicating Your Child's Needs, Understanding First Steps Parental Rights,* and *Understanding the IFSP Process.* Approximately 82 families and professionals accessed the series during 2011-12. Of the 82 trained, 55 training evaluations were collected. Data collected from those 55 evaluations indicate 100% of the respondents agreed the training and handouts were of high quality, 95% of the respondents agreed the information presented was relevant, 86.2% of the respondents agreed they will use this information for their child's education (11.3% responded n/a), 94.5% of the respondents agreed they will use this information to support other families (5.5% responded n/a), and 83.7% of the respondents agreed they will use this information to improve educational policy and practice (16.3% responded n/a). Additional regional training for families and professionals is planned for 2012-13.

Each year MPACT analyzes family survey data, focusing on a small number of key questions to develop topics for the parent newsletters. In addition to the family survey results, the topics for parent newsletters may be determined by a review of program data and content selected by the local programs or the State. The newsletters are disseminated to all families receiving First Steps services. In 2011-12, the topics addressed in parent newsletters included Important Facts About Sleep and Young Children, Early Intervention Teams, Annual Family Survey Results, and Five Facts Every Family Should Know About Behavior. The information gathered from an analysis of the 2011-12 family survey results will become topics for the 2012-13 newsletters.

In 2011-12, additional materials for families were developed in response to parent need, as evidenced through an analysis of the annual family survey data. MPACT developed three Parent Fact Sheets which include information on Effective Communication with Your Team, Early Intervention Parent Checklist and Resources, and Roles and Responsibilities of Families in Early Intervention. The fact sheets were included as handouts in the *Steps to Success* trainings and posted online at: http://www.ptimpact.org/.

DRAFT

Family Mentor System: During 2011-12, the State continued the SICC discussions on family leadership and network of support as it relates to a family mentor system. Members of the council presented options for developing parent leadership through existing infrastructures such as other agency systems and regional councils. In the April 2012 SICC meeting, information on the Family to Family Resource Center's parent support network and mentoring program, Sharing our Strengths, through University of Missouri-Kansas City Institute for Human Development was presented. Discussions about parent leadership and a family mentor program will continue in 2012-13.

Service Coordinator Trainings: State staff conducted quarterly SPOE Director meetings and/or trainings as a way to ensure guidance is disseminated and current practice is in place. In addition to the State meetings, monthly staff meetings/trainings between SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators occur in most regions and consist of reminders or updates to policies and procedures. SPOE Director meetings and Service Coordinator trainings conducted by the State in 2011-12 consisted of the following topics: Transition C to B, Early Childhood Outcomes, Compliance Monitoring Procedures, Parental Consent, and Service Delivery through Early Intervention Teams. SPOE Director meetings will continue to be held on a quarterly basis and trainings with Service Coordinators will occur on an as needed basis in 2012-13.

To assist with future training, State staff attended the 2011 national conference on Measuring & Improving Child & Family Outcomes to review the national materials for ECO and Family Outcomes. Information from the national conference led to the State's consideration to modify family outcomes procedures and a possible pilot project in 2012-13 to utilize several national resources obtained from the conference.

DRAFT

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	0.85% of infants and toddlers birth to 1 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 0.97% of children birth to age 1 served by First Steps, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 1 with IFSPs

Description	December 2009	December 2010	December 2011
Child Count	676	703	**730**
Estimated Population*	80,605	76,119	**74,978**
Missouri %	0.84%	0.92%	**0.97%**
National %	1.03%	1.03%	**1.02%**

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from 618, Table C-13 at https://www.ideadata.org/arc_toc13.asp#partcCC.

DRAFT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

In Missouri, the estimated population decreased by 1.5% but the number of children birth to age 1 increased by 3.8% and Missouri met the target for 2011-12.

The Improvement Activity for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide information and/or resources to primary referral sources in order to improve child find procedures, reduce inappropriate referrals, and target underserved populations

Discussion of the Improvement Activity follows:

Provide Information/Resources to Primary Referral Sources: SPOE Directors and Area Directors participated in various State and local early childhood conferences, such as Conference on the Young Years, to share referral information and procedures. Conference attendees received information regarding the First Steps program including eligibility requirements and referral procedures.

In 2011-12, Area Directors and SPOE Directors assisted the Parents As Teachers (PAT) National Center, located in St. Louis, Missouri, with facilitating First Steps presentations at special needs training and in-services for PAT educators. At these presentations, information was shared regarding the First Steps program, including IDEA, eligibility criteria, facilitating appropriate referrals and referral procedures. Additionally, each Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) also reported collaboration with PAT as well as local hospitals, physician's offices, Early Head Start (EHS) offices, the Department of Mental Health and local early childhood programs.

State staff participated in the Missouri Head Start advisory council and Missouri's SpecialQuest Birth-5 Initiative in order to support local efforts in providing collaborative high quality services to families of children with disabilities. Collaboration throughout 2011-12 included the areas of identification, evaluation, IFSP development, professional development, transition and inclusion.

An analysis of 2011-12 data indicated the overall number of referrals increased 8%. The medical community remains the largest primary source of referrals. In 2011-12, physician referrals increased 38%, NICU referrals increased 19%, and other health care provider referrals increased 14% compared to the previous year. Referrals from the Department of Health and Senior Services also increased with 21% more referrals than the previous year. However, public health facility referrals decreased 21% compared to the previous year. Upon further analysis of the data results, it was determined there are regional variances in the amount and type of primary referral sources, particularly in CAPTA, PAT and EHS referrals. Regional differences may be due to the extent of the SPOEs utilization of a regional interagency council and the level of participation council members have in assisting the SPOE with child find, public awareness and knowledge of the program's eligibility criteria.

After taking a closer look at the data, the State determined there were no patterns in the eligibility percentages throughout the State. Approximately half of the referrals in all regions do not result in an IFSP due to a variety of reasons including parent withdrawal prior to IFSP development, the inability to contact the family after the initial referral is made and determining ineligibility for the program. Given Missouri's narrow eligibility criteria, it is expected there will be a certain percentage of ineligible children. However, regional data revealed two SPOE regions had lower percentages in ineligibility for the program compared to the statewide data. However, those two same regions also had high parent withdrawal from the program before eligibility determination, which would affect the region's ineligibility percentage.

Given the variances in the statewide data, there continues to be a need to assist the SPOEs in educating parents and primary referral sources about the First Steps program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	1.67% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 2.21% of children birth to 3 served by First Steps, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 3 with IFSPs

Description	December 2009	December 2010	December 2011
Child Count	4,200	4,539	**5,024**
Estimated Population*	244,769	231,982	**226,932**
Missouri %	1.72%	1.96%	**2.21%**
National %	2.67%	2.82%	**2.79%**

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from 618, Table C-13 at https://www.ideadata.org/arc_toc13.asp#partcCC.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

In Missouri, the estimated population decreased by 2.2%, but the number of children birth to age 3 increased by 10.7% and Missouri met the target for 2011-12.

See Indicator 5 for discussion of Improvement Activities related to this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

DRAFT

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100.0% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timelines

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

At 100.0%, Missouri met the 100% target for this indicator.

45-Day Timeline Data:

Data reported below based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State (see Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

Initial IFSPs	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
# IFSPs with acceptable timelines*	47	72	**56**
Total IFSPs	47	75	**56**
% with acceptable timelines	100.0%	96.0%	**100.0%**

*"Acceptable timelines" includes those evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within the 45-day timeline as well as those that went over 45 days due to parent or child reasons. Both the IFSPs with acceptable timelines (numerator) and the total IFSPs (denominator) include delays due to exceptional family circumstances.

In Missouri, SPOEs are monitored for compliance with the 45-day timeline by calculating the actual number of days from referral to initial IFSP for an eligible child.

In 2011-12, a total of 56 records were reviewed for 45-day timeline. Of the 56 records, 53 children had an initial IFSP within the 45-day timeline and three children had an acceptable reason for the delay in an initial IFSP within 45 days.

The only acceptable reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline is a Parent/Child Delay, which indicates an exceptional family circumstance (e.g., child illness/hospitalization, family vacation, and unable to locate family).

Unacceptable reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline include: Provider Delay, Service Coordinator Delay, and No Provider Available. A Provider Delay indicates the provider was the reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline (e.g., not scheduling the evaluation with the family, not providing the evaluation report). A Service Coordinator Delay indicates the Service Coordinator was the reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline (e.g., Service Coordinator vacation, illness, unavailability). A delay due to No Provider Available indicates no provider could be located to evaluate the child or assist in the eligibility determination process.

The following table provides detail on the reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline:

45-Day Timeline Calculation Details	Number
Initial IFSPs	**56**
Initial IFSPs under 45 days	**53**
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with acceptable reasons	**3**
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with unacceptable reasons	**0**
Total under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	**56**
Percent under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	**100.0%**

For the children listed above whose 45-day timeline was not met, the delays ranged from 1 to 34 days beyond the 45-day timeline. Acceptable reasons for the delays were due to child or family illness/hospitalization. There were no unacceptable reasons.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

The State met the target of 100.0% compliance. Progress from the previous year is noted. It was determined the progress was due to WebSPOE system enhancements, including a Provider Service Request form that provides prompt communication between the Service Coordinator and the evaluator in order to inform the evaluator of an upcoming evaluation and the 45-day timeline. WebSPOE system enhancements also included functionality for the evaluator to electronically upload the evaluation report.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs not in compliance with 45-day timeline requirements
- Provide training and professional development to SPOEs and providers in the area of 45-day timelines

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The State reported 96% compliance on this indicator in the previous APR; therefore, targeted technical assistance was provided this fiscal year to the two SPOE agencies not in compliance. The Area Directors provided training to the two SPOE agencies that consisted of a review of guidance documents, a group discussion and an activity to practice determining the reason for delay.

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency conducts quarterly meetings with all ten SPOE agencies, which includes attendance by the SPOE Directors, lead Service Coordinators and Area Directors. During these meetings, the SPOE staff share challenges related to SPOE operations and ask questions regarding Department policies and procedures. In 2011-12, the Area Directors provided monthly targeted technical assistance to the SPOEs regarding formal and informal assessment procedures, revised screening policies, eligibility determination and transdisciplinary service delivery.

Throughout 2011-12, the Area Directors conducted provider trainings on the use of formal and informal evaluation measures as well as the 45-day timeline. The Area Directors also conducted regional provider trainings on the use of the Routines-Based Interview™ as a family assessment and meeting the 45-day timeline. Technical assistance and follow-up was given to providers on an as needed basis. Ongoing technical assistance to providers will continue in 2012-13.

DRAFT

In addition to face-to-face trainings, two additional resources were disseminated to Service Coordinators and providers in 2011-12. In February 2012, an online training module about evaluation and assessment was updated and released to the Department's website at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/moduletraining.html. Service Coordinators and providers currently enrolled in the First Steps program were encouraged to review the new module; however, new Service Coordinators and providers are required to take the module. Also, in February 2012 a provider newsletter containing information regarding the 45-day timeline requirements was disseminated to all Service Coordinators and providers currently enrolled in the First Steps program.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11, which was based on results from the 2009-10 monitoring, because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of additional data; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

DRAFT

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of all children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning by their third birthday

8A: Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

Actual Target Data for 2011-12: At 98.4%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for 8A.

Data reported below based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State (see Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

Description	Number of Children
Children Exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	**60**
Children Exiting Part C	**61**
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday	**98.4%**

The results for 8A were gathered by reviewing a randomly selected transition file for every Service Coordinator in each of the five SPOEs monitored. The number of files reviewed for each SPOE ranged in number from 6 files in the smallest/rural SPOE to 22 files in the largest/urban SPOE monitored.

Trend data for 8A:

Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Percent in compliance (8A)	100.0%	100.0%	**98.4%**

8B: Children Exiting Part C Where Notification to the LEA Occurred:

Actual Target Data for 2011-12: At 95.1%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for 8B.

Data reported below are based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State (see Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

Description	Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B
Number of files reviewed	**61**
Number of parents who opted out	**0**
Number of parents providing consent	**61**
Number of LEAs notified	**58**
Percent in compliance 2011-12	**95.1%**

DRAFT

The results for 8B were gathered from file reviews of the same children reported in 8A who exited the program during 2011-12.

Missouri has an opt out policy that was approved by OSEP in 2009. The current opt out policy is available in the current Missouri Part C State Plan for Special Education at: http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/documents/PartCStatePlan2012final.pdf.

In the monitoring sample selection in this 2011-12 report, there was no indication any parent opted out of the notification to LEA.

Trend data for 8B:

Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Percent in compliance (8B)	100.0%	100.0%	**95.1%**

8C: Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B:

Actual Target Data for 2011-12: At 100%, Missouri met the 100% target for 8C.

Data reported below are based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State (see Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

Description	Number of Children
Number of children exiting Part C	**61**
Number of late referrals*	**6**
Number in compliance with 90 day timeline	**54**
Number in compliance but delay due to exceptional family circumstances**	**1**
Total in compliance	**55**

Number out of compliance	**0**
Percent in compliance 2011-12	**100%**

*Four children were referred between 135 and 90 days before third birthday and two children referred less than 90 days before third birthday. In these cases the transition meetings were held in conjunction with the initial IFSP meeting. These are excluded from the calculation.

**One child's transition meeting was delayed four days due to the parent rescheduling multiple times. This exceptional family circumstance has been included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8C.

The results for 8C were gathered from file reviews of the same children reported in 8A and 8B who exited the program during 2011-12.

Trend data for 8C:

Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Percent in compliance (8C)	91.2%	100.0%	**100.0%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

Missouri's performance on 8A and 8B slipped from 100% to 98.4% for 8A and 95.1% for 8B. Performance on 8C remained at 100%.

Upon analysis of the performance on 8A, it was determined only one of the 61 records reviewed did not have an IFSP with complete transition steps and services. After a closer look at that IFSP, the Service Coordinator documented some of the steps and services, but all required steps and services were not documented in order to meet compliance for this indicator. As this was the only instance in which incomplete information on steps and services was found in the records reviewed, the State estimated the slippage in steps and services was due to an isolated instance.

In Missouri, all children in Part C are potentially eligible for Part B. Upon analysis of the performance on 8B, it was determined only three of the 61 records reviewed did not have documentation of LEA notification or that the parent opted out of LEA notification. After a closer look at these instances, it was determined the three records were from three different regions and three different Service Coordinators. In each instance, the Service Coordinator did not have documentation that all five pieces of information (i.e., child name, date of birth, parent name, parent address and parent phone number) were provided to the local school district to constitute LEA notification or that the parent opted out of LEA notification. Thus, the State estimated the slippage in LEA notification was due to isolated instances.

The State continues to have high performance in 8C with 100% of children exiting Part C having a Transition conference.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development to all SPOE agencies to improve collaboration and coordination with families and school districts in the area of C to B Transition, including IFSPs with transition steps and services, notification to LEA, and timelines

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The Department maintains a webpage specifically for Transition C to B topics in order to organize all transition training materials and technical assistance documents in one place. This page can be viewed at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/Transitionindexpg.htm. In the past, statewide Transition C to B training was conducted in the spring of every other year. However, due to travel restraints and increased access to technology, the State considered alternative methods to delivering C to B trainings.

At the State level, an online training module about transition was updated and released to the Department's website at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/moduletraining.html in February 2012. Service

DRAFT

Coordinators and providers currently enrolled in the First Steps program were encouraged to review the new module; however, new Service Coordinators and providers are required to take the module.

Part C to B transition webinars were conducted in March 2012 and again in May 2012 in order to inform the field about the requirements and timelines for both Part C and Part B. An earlier webinar to introduce the new Part C federal regulations, including changes in transition requirements, was held in December 2011. Staff from both Part C and Part B attended the webinars. Part C staff presented the First Steps requirements at an Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Coalition meeting of ECSE directors in October 2011 and again in April 2012. From these meetings, a FAQ document was created and posted on the Department's website. Finally, Listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year.

At the local level, the SPOE prepares a packet of transition information, including a DVD and handbook about transition, for all families in Part C. Service Coordinators disseminate the packets to families as they begin discussions about the transition process. In addition to the family packets, some regions held joint Part C and Part B meetings between SPOE staff and local ECSE staff to discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between the two programs to facilitate successful transitions for families. Finally, regional interagency meetings have included topics of discussion related to successful transition from Part C to Part B. Ongoing technical assistance by the Area Directors is available to SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators as needed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Indicator 8A

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11, which was based on results from the 2009-10 monitoring, because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance 8A: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8A: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Indicator 8B

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11, which was based on results from the 2009-10 monitoring, because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance 8B: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8B: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Indicator 8C

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: Findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11 based on results from the review of 2009-10 records. To verify correction of noncompliance, two additional files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

DRAFT

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: 8C: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8C: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8A: OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8B: OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8C: OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

a. # of findings of noncompliance
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

DRAFT

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

Missouri had 100% correction of noncompliance identified in 2010-11.

Missouri requires 100% correction of identified noncompliance in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional State standards and indicators.

The Indicator 9 table reflects the findings related to the Indicator/Indicator Clusters for noncompliance identified in 2010-11 based on results from the 2009-10 monitoring. Data in the Indicator 9 table may differ from data reported for correction of noncompliance under Indicators 1, 7 and 8 because the Indicator 9 table includes additional data related to the findings reported in Indicators 1, 7 and 8 as well as the actual data from those indicators.

The findings issued in 2010-11 and subsequent correction of those finding are reported in the following Indicator 9 table:

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	36	36
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs 6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and	Monitoring Activities:	5	46	46

DRAFT

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities:	4	9	9
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring Activities:	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			92	92
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	**100.0%**

DRAFT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

The State met the target of 100% for this indicator.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development through Area Directors to SPOEs for development and implementation of corrective action plans
- Manage/support a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency employs First Steps Area Directors to assist SPOEs with specific issues identified through compliance monitoring reviews, which includes assistance in developing and implementing corrective action plans. Training and/or individual technical assistance is provided in each SPOE region, as needed, to ensure SPOE staff are informed about and operating under compliant procedures.

General Supervision System: The lead agency supports two systems, IMACS and WebSPOE, which help to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. First, the IMACS system is a database that includes Part C compliance file reviews and corrective action plans. Second, the WebSPOE system is a database that contains all elements of referral, intake, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation for all children referred to First Steps. The system is compliance-driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice, which makes the WebSPOE system an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system.

As outlined in the SPOE contractual agreement, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is considered out of compliance and subject to sanctions per the contract standards.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: Findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2010-11 based on results from the review of 2009-10 records. To verify correction of noncompliance, two additional files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance reported in the Indicator 9 table. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of additional data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program,

DRAFT

consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 1 and 7 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of noncompliance in this table under those indicators. Further, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the table for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of additional data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State used the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

The State reported on correction of noncompliance for indicators 1, 7, and 8C as described under those indicators in the APR.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to report on Indicator 10 in the FFY 2011 APR.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to report on Indicator 11 in the FFY 2011 APR.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

Not applicable as Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

Not applicable.

DRAFT

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	Not set due to lack of baseline data

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

There were no mediation requests during 2011-12.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions were made in the State Performance Plan. Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to develop baseline, targets and Improvement Activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

DRAFT

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2011-12

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and

b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011-12	100% of State reported data will be timely and accurate

DRAFT

Actual Target Data for 2011-12:

Missouri met the 100% target for this indicator.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- WebSPOE system - WebSPOE is a web-based system used to maintain child level data for the First Steps program. These data are used for the Section 618 child count, primary setting and exit reporting. WebSPOE is also used for APR Indicators 2, 3, 5, 6.
- Monitoring – data gathered through monitoring reviews are utilized for Indicators 1, 7, 8 and 9.
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 10-13.
- Survey – The First Steps family survey is sent annually to all active families and includes a variety of questions related to family experience in the program. The family survey is used for APR Indicator 4.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011-12:

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% for timely and accurate State reported data. All 618 data and required reports have been submitted on or before the due dates. OSEP data reports, as well as data submitted in the SPP/APR, are accurate as evidenced by the verification efforts described below.

Improvement Activities for 2011-12 included the following:

- Support the development and implementation of the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and the WebSPOE data system
- Provide information to Area Directors and SPOE Directors regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Data Systems: Missouri implemented the WebSPOE system on September 1, 2005 with enhancements released throughout 2011-12 to update the system. The WebSPOE system captures data elements of the Part C program and contains information about referral, intake, eligibility determination and IFSP development and implementation. The WebSPOE system is compliance-driven, meaning it requires critical data items and conducts edit checks on data to help ensure accuracy. The WebSPOE system supplies data that can be reviewed at the local and State levels for program evaluation and monitoring purposes. Much of the data for the SPP/APR comes from the WebSPOE system, and various data elements are verified for accuracy on a regular basis.

The Department has fully implemented a student-level data collection system, MOSIS. A Department workgroup, including special education data staff, identify and define the necessary data elements for MOSIS. The Department has worked to ensure definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. A key element of MOSIS is a unique identifier for each student, called the MOSIS ID. A MOSIS ID is obtained for every child in the First Steps program so data can be linked from the First Steps system to the Missouri PK-12 public school system. Extensive technical assistance to public schools and SPOEs ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

Data Reports: Throughout 2011-12, the State provided the public with monthly SPOE data reports of key indicators related to primary referral sources, eligibility rates, active child count and inactivation reasons. These reports are available at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html. These reports are reviewed on a monthly basis by the Area Directors and the SPOE Directors to ensure accurate data collection and reporting. Monthly reports are analyzed by the Area Directors on a quarterly basis and technical assistance is provided to the SPOE on an as needed basis.

In January of each year, the State reviews the results of the SPP indictors with the SPOE Directors to verify accurate data and then the State publically reports the regional results of the SPP indicators. The regional report of SPP performance is available at: http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2011-12:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2010 (2010-11) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.

Department Response: Per OSEP instructions for this APR, the Indicator 14 Data Rubric is optional. Missouri chose not to include the rubric in this APR.

DRAFT