Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™

# STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

## MISSOURI PART B
## 2005-2006 through 2012-2013

**Updated January 28, 2011**
**Updated April 18, 2011**
**Office of Special Education**

# Table of Contents

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: ..... 1

**Indicator 1 –** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma ..... 13

**Indicator 2 –** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school ..... 20

**Indicator 3 –** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: ..... 22

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

**Indicator 4 –** Rates of suspension and expulsion: ..... 27

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

**Indicator 5 –** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: ..... 33

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

**Indicator 6 –** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: ..... 36

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

**Indicator 7 –** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: ..... 37

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

**Indicator 8 –** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. ..... 42

**Indicator 9 –** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification ..... 45

**Indicator 10 –** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification ..... 48

**Indicator 11 –** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. ..... 51

**Indicator 12 –** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. ..... 54

**Indicator 13 –** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. ..... 56

**Indicator 14 –** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: ..... 60

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

**Indicator 15 –** 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. ..... 64

**Indicator 16 –** 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. ..... 69

**Indicator 17 –** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. ..... 71

**Indicator 18 –** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. ..... 73

**Indicator 19 –** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements ..... 75

**Indicator 20 –** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. ..... 77

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2013

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS SPP HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). INFORMATION FROM EARLIER VERSIONS OF THE SPP IS ARCHIVED AND CAN BE LOCATED AT HTTP://DESE.MO.GOV/DIVSPECED/SPPPAGE.HTML.**

During the August 18-19, 2005, meeting of Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), staff from the Office of Special Education of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department), along with personnel from the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) presented on the requirements of the new State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Reports (APR), in context of the history of improvement planning in the state. The SEAP is a statewide stakeholder group made up of parents of students with disabilities, general and special educators, administrators and other service providers. The SEAP has served as the steering committee for previous self-assessment and improvement planning processes and APRs. It was agreed that the Office of Special Education would develop preliminary targets and improvement activities that would then be presented regionally across the state in order to gain public input for the Plan.

In proposing targets for the next six years, the Office of Special Education gathered data on the indicators which require targets and looked at three to five years of historical data for students with disabilities and compared that to data for all students where applicable. Logarithmic trends were then applied to the historical data. A logarithmic trend line is a best-fit curve that is used when the rate of change in the data increases or decreases quickly and then levels out as is the case with many types of performance data. Along with the historical and projected trend data, DESE considered other pertinent information, including compliance requirements and evidence-based practices that have already been implemented at the state or local levels. In proposing improvement activities, the Office of Special Education primarily referred to the Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2003-04 which included future activities, many of which had been developed through the state's improvement planning process.

The Office of Special Education created a presentation in order to gain public input on the proposed targets and improvement activities. Special Education Consultants in Regional Professional Development Centers were trained on the presentation and held eleven public input sessions across the state during the second and third weeks of October 2005. The public input sessions were posted on the web and announced to the public in various ways, including announcements at the Special Education Administrators' Conference, the Council of Administrators of Special Education meeting, various regional meetings, and the Special Education Listserv which reaches all school districts and various organizations. In addition, flyers were sent to SEAP members for distribution.

Across the eleven public input sessions, 63 people attended including Local Education Agency (LEA) special education administrators and parents of children with disabilities. The input was compiled and used to revise targets for school-age least restrictive environments, and to remove, revise or add improvement activities. The revised State Performance Plan was presented to the SEAP November 4, 2005, and additional feedback was incorporated into the final plan.

Per OSEP instructions, for this SPP:

- SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).
- New baseline data, targets and Improvement Activities for Indicators 4B, 13 and 14 have been included.
- Targets for Indicator 7 have been revised to reflect improvement over the baseline.

Public input on the extended targets and improvement activities was obtained when this SPP was presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010 and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE) in January 2011.

**Overview of Missouri's Educational System:**

Missouri has 523 local educational agencies (LEAs) or school districts, three state board operated programs (Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf and Missouri Schools for the Severely Disabled), and 33 charter schools located in the St. Louis City and Kansas City school districts. The Department is also responsible for oversight of educational programs provided through the Division of Youth Services (DYS), Department of Mental Health (DMH) and the Department of Corrections (DOC).

No school districts in the state have an average daily attendance of more than 50,000 so none are required to be included in the sample each year.

**Data Sources, Collection and Reporting**

**Public Dissemination and Reporting:** All State Performance Plans are posted on the Department's website, and districts are notified of their posting via the Special Education Listserv as well as through a mailing to Superintendents. The Department reports annually to the public on the state's performance compared to the targets established in the SPP. In addition, the Department reports annually to the public on the performance of each LEA through public "report cards" or "profiles" posted on the Department's website, under School Data and Statistics at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district.

**Public reporting of statewide data:** The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Special Education State Profile is posted on the DESE website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the DESE website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a special education listserv which is disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders and these resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

**MOSIS and Core Data:** The Department began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007-08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System, or MOSIS. Prior to that, the Core Data Collection System (a web-based data collection system with interactive edits) was used to gather data from districts. MOSIS includes a variety of edit checks which help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 14.

**DESE Contract Development and Management System in FormHog:** In May 2008 the Office of Special Education contracted with the company FormHog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line Contract Development and Management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all information related to vendor contracts (e.g. contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, as well as processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

**Missouri Assessment Program (MAP):** Missouri's statewide assessment program provides the data used for SPP Indicator 3. The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8 in the areas of Math, Communication Arts and Science. Prior to the 2008-09

school year, at the high school level, Communication Arts was assessed at grade 11 and Mathematics was assessed at grade 10.

Beginning in 2008-09 the following required End-of-Course (EOC) assessments were administered at the secondary level in place of the MAP: Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Government was administered as a required EOC assessment beginning in 2009-10.

An alternate assessment, the MAP-Alternate (MAP-A), is available for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet grade level and state eligibility criteria as determined by their Individualized Education Program (IEP) team. The MAP-A is a portfolio-based assessment that measures student performance based on alternate achievement standards that are aligned with Missouri's Show-Me Standards. For the MAP-A, Communication Arts is assessed at grades 3-8 and 11, Math is assessed at grades 3-8 and 10, and Science is assessed at grades 5, 8 and 11.

Public reports of assessment data are available online at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html.

**Special Education General Supervision Monitoring:** Data is gathered in conjunction with the special education monitoring review either in the review year, or in the year prior to the review through the Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment for SPP Indicators 8, 11, 12 and 13. Data for Part C to Part B transition timelines and initial evaluation timelines are gathered for all students in the districts being reviewed in any given year. Data on parent involvement are gathered through a parent advance questionnaire done in conjunction with the Department's general school accreditation system, the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), review. Data on secondary transition plans are gathered on a representative sample of students for each district being reviewed in any given year.

**Systems Administration and Monitoring**

**IMACS:** The Office of Special Education has a web-based general supervision management system, called IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006-07 school year and data from the system is used to address districts' performance on the SPP Indicators. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews, and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Office of Special Education for either the cyclical/annual review processes or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

**Cyclical Monitoring**

**Focused Monitoring and State Improvement Grant Priority Areas:** The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) is responsible for accrediting all public schools in the state and does so over a five-year cycle. Local school districts and other responsible agencies (charter schools, DOC, DYS, and the three state board operated programs) are each reviewed once during the five-year MSIP cycle.

Missouri is currently in the last year of the fourth cycle of MSIP (2006-07 through 2010-11), and the Department is working to finalize plans for the fifth cycle which begins with the 2011-12 school year. All districts in the state are divided among the five years of the cycle, and each year contains a representative sample of districts. In order to determine if the sets of districts are each representative of the state, data have been examined by the following factors:

- Number of districts in each year of cycle. Each year has approximately 105 districts.
- Region of the state as defined by the areas for the nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC). All regions are represented in each year of the cycle.
- Total enrollment and enrollment by race. All races are represented in each year of the cycle.
- Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. The percentage of eligible students is relatively consistent across all years.

Enrollment size groups. Districts are divided into enrollment size groups of 1-200, 201-400, 401-88, 801-2000, 2001-6000 and 6000+. All enrollment size groups are represented in all years of the cycle.

DESE has a policy of reviewing all programs in a district during the same year, therefore the Office of Special Education adopts the MSIP review cycle. Since the districts in each year of the cycle represent the state as a whole as described above, the Office of Special Education will be able to gather certain data required by this State Performance Plan in conjunction with the MSIP review cycle.

**Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators:** The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance-based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance-based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most self assessment activities that are required of districts by the Office of Special Education are based on the State Performance Plan results indicators and whether the district met the state's criteria related to the targets established in the SPP. If, during the year prior to their MSIP review year, a district does not meet established performance criteria, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to any performance area not met.

In addition to a focused file review, the Office of Special Education requires a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, the Office of Special Education collects data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitors for compliance in these areas.

**Follow-up Procedures and Correction of Noncompliance**: Per OSEP instructions, the State ensures that each LEA 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 such as data subsequently collected through onsite 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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Corrective Action Plans are required for all identified noncompliance and all noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Compliance supervisors request additional data as part of the follow-up review. This data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and districts may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified.

Districts must also correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days of the receipt of the report of findings. Compliance supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services, evaluations completed) have been put in place.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web based monitoring system (IMACS) and frequent contact with the districts by RPDC consultants and Department supervisors. When districts attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance, they are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months.

**Onsite Reviews:** Districts are selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program). Based upon the data, districts may be identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, identified in only the area of elementary achievement or identified in only the area of post secondary transition. Data analysis by Department staff and Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants occur prior to the review, and a hypothesis is developed to identify root causes of the district's poor performance. While onsite, the reviews include individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered is reviewed by the team and used to support or deny the

hypothesis. Exit conferences are held with district staff to report any areas in need of improvement and answer any questions from the districts.

Within six weeks of the review, the districts receive reports of the onsite review which include a Corrective Action Plan, when necessary. The districts are also required to report on activities related to the areas identified through an Improvement Plan and subsequent Activity Reports.

As was stated previously, the Office of Special Education's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used by the Department Office of Quality Schools for the fourth cycle of MSIP. The MSIP and the special education reviews, which are aligned and complement each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both reviews to be conducted onsite.

**Improvement planning and scoring guide:** Improvement planning is used for both Improvement Grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on the Department's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of the web-based systems of Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGS).

The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors that the Department will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the criteria established for identified performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. Identified areas in need of improvement are addressed through objectives and strategies.

**Annual Monitoring**

**Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS):** CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. Districts using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education through 1) ePeGs on the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), starting with the 2008-09 FER, and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER. Both the RVS and Part B FER are due July 30 each year.

Districts that provided CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the FER:

- Professional development provided to teachers and other school staff
- Detail of what educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction was provided
- Number of students who received CEIS using IDEA Part B funds who were not eligible for IDEA services at the time they received these services during the school year
- Of the students who had IEPs during this school year, report the number that had received CEIS using IDEA funds anytime in the past two school years

Districts that provided CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the CEIS RVS:

- Date the CEIS activity occurred
- Description of the CEIS activity that occurred
- Cost of the CEIS activity
- Titles of all participants that attended the activity (i.e. 4th Grade Reading Teacher)
- Number of Special Education Students served by the CEIS activity (this number should be zero as CEIS is for students without an IEP)
- Funding source to verify that districts aren't supplanting CEIS funds
- Group(s) benefiting from the CEIS activity

The Special Education Funds Management section in the Division of Financial and Administrative Services reviews the information submitted on the Part B FER in ePeGS in conjunction with the RVS. The information is evaluated for the following requirements:

- The professional development provided to teachers and other school staff that enable such personnel to deliver scientifically based academic and behavioral interventions, including scientifically based literacy instruction, and, where appropriate, instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software, was appropriate under CEIS.
- Educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction being provided, was appropriate under CEIS.
- Students receiving CEIS were not identified as Special Education students.
- Funds for CEIS supplemented and not supplanted ESEA activities.
- The LEA did not exclusively use CEIS funds for groups significantly over identified.

Upon review of district documentation, the Funds Management section informs districts of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the district is required to return these funds to the Office of Special Education from the district's state and local funds.

**Disproportionate Representation:** The Department reviews data annually to identify any districts with disproportionate representation. See Indicators 9 and 10 for criteria and review procedures.

**Significant Disproportionality:** The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education contracts the significant disproportionality reviews to be conducted with a specific vendor. This vendor is responsible for coordinating the district reviews of policies, practices, and procedures that impact eligibility determinations and placement decisions. The vendor also serves as the contact point for districts undergoing review.

The district review process for significant disproportionality consists of the following steps:

**Step 1.** The district is required to complete a District Self-Assessment using the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems' (NCCRESt) Equity in Special Education Placement tools (Form A and B) available at http://www.nccrest.org/publications/tools/assessment.html. The required District Self-Assessment tool must be returned to the Assistant Commissioner of Special Education, P. O. Box 480, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 by [date].

**Step 2.** Through a contract with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, a specified contractor conducts the on-site review of the policies, procedures, and practices in your district that impact eligibility determinations and placement decisions. The contractor uses the District Self-Assessment tools, along with other methodologies (focus groups, interviews) to complete the review of each district's policies, procedures, and/or practices.

**Step 3.** The contractor uses all informational sources, including the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems' (NCCRESt) Equity Rubric http://www.nccrest.org/publications/tools.html to develop a final report for the district. The "District Findings and Report" summarizes the group's findings and recommendations regarding any policy, practice, or procedure that the district has in place that might be contributing to inappropriate identification

and or inappropriate placement of students in racial or ethnic groups in special education. District reports are completed and submitted to Office of Special Education by the independent contractor.

**Step 4.** Office of Special Education Compliance Section staff reviews each "District Findings and Report" and determines compliance with IDEA. The State Education Agency has the final decision regarding the district's compliance and orders corrective action plans when necessary. An additional condition of any issued Corrective Action Plan or Improvement Plan is a requirement to districts to send in documentation of any revisions made to existing policies, procedures, and practices and provide evidence of how the district has publicly reported these revisions.

**Step 5.** Districts identified as having significant disproportionality of racial and ethnic students in special education due to inappropriate identification are required to use fifteen percent (15%) of their total IDEA funds to address their respective disproportionality issues through early intervening services as allowed under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

**Step 6.** Targeted technical assistance through the Regional Professional Development Center Special Education Consultants is available to districts that are required to have corrective action plans. **Districts identified as having significant disproportionality may not take advantage of the allowable 50% reduction of Maintenance of Effort.

**Discipline:** The Department reviews data annually to identify any districts with significant discrepancies in discipline rates. See Indicator 4 for criteria and review procedures.

**Program Development**

**Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants**: The Office of Special Education has been awarding improvement grants to districts on a competitive basis for the past five years. The improvement plan described above serves as the grant application. District training on improvement planning with scoring guides is held in the fall of each year and is available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level to promote changes leading toward improved outcomes for students with disabilities. The districts submit activity reports during the year which serve as a progress report and an expenditure report.

**Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network:** The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed for an effective learning environment are in place for all students. This network is comprised of the following personnel:

- State Coordinator
- Assistant State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- State-wide Secondary/Tertiary Level Consultants (5)
- Regional Consultants (24).

The Data/Web Consultant is working to formalize a cohesive system of MO SW-PBS data collection available for review at building, district, and state levels. This position also offers state-wide support through posting of various resources on the MO SW-PBS website (www.pbismissouri.org). The Secondary/Tertiary Level Consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for buildings that have met criteria at the universal level. These consultants also train Regional Consultants to provide implementation assistance at these tiers. The Regional Consultants provide building and district level support across a spectrum of implementation issues. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the OSEP-funded Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports National Center located at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Data collected through the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and the state-developed MO SW-PBS School Data Profile (housed within the FormHog interface) indicate that districts/buildings participating in the state SW-PBS initiative have shown improvements in student attendance, student

achievement, and least restrictive environment. A complete report of MO SW-PBS data may be accessed at www.pbismissouri.org/pubs.

**Response to Intervention (RtI):** Missouri is one of eight states chosen to receive intensive technical assistance from the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI). The State's current action plan with the NCRTI includes identified action steps aligning Response to Intervention (RtI) implementation with other state three-tiered model initiatives such as Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) and Professional Learning Communities (PLC), development of a plan for constructing supports and resources for RtI across the state, continued knowledge and capacity building for district staff concerning RtI implementation, and development of an assessment tool to collect data on current practices related to RtI implementation throughout the state.

Three-tiered models of intervention have long been supported and promoted by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as both effective and efficient methods of creating responsive organizational frameworks that facilitate systems change. The primary reason for the promotion and support of these models of intervention is that they have been shown by research to positively affect student outcomes. As an extension of this work, a position was created in August of 2009 for a Director of Three-Tiered Model Coordination. The purpose of this position is to focus on promoting, coordinating, and aligning three-tiered models of intervention throughout the state. The Director also works with NCRTI as the state contact.

Another responsibility of the Director of Three-tiered Model Coordination is to carry out three-tiered model promotion in conjunction with other agencies (e.g. Center for Advancement of Mental Health Practices in Schools at the University of Missouri and the IDEA Partnership) with the ultimate goal of improved outcomes for all students. As part of the work with the IDEA Partnership, the Missouri Community of Practice (CoP) on the IDEA Partnership's SharedWork website (www.sharedwork.org) focuses on linking education and mental health stakeholder groups. Through this CoP, a successful partnership among state agencies and other education and mental health stakeholders is being developed by embracing three-tiered models as a vehicle for systems change. Another example of this collaborative work is the interagency workgroup, comprised of education and mental health professionals from various state and other agencies, focused on development of tertiary level SW-PBS curriculum, evaluation, and expansion of state service systems to provide activities, training, and other projects.

In an effort to further align these models, a Three-Tiered Model State Leadership Team is currently in place. This team includes the Assistant Commissioners of the Office of Quality Schools, the Office of Special Education, the Office of College and Career Readiness, and the Office of Early and Extended Learning; the Director of Three-Tiered Models of Intervention (academic RtI); the Director of School Improvement Initiatives (PLC); the Assistant Director of Effective Practices (SW-PBS); and the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Project Director. Future plans include the integration of the State Advisory Committees for PLC, MIM, SW-PBS, and academic RtI to create a single statewide Three-Tiered Model Advisory Committee. Missouri's establishment of a statewide advisory group representing all three-tiered models of intervention gives authority to an interrelated group to make recommendations to the State's Three-Tiered Model Leadership Team for consideration regarding policies, practices, procedures and decision making. This group will also enhance the collaboration among the three-tiered models of intervention currently practiced and promoted in Missouri as well as strengthen the positive impact of each model on student achievement statewide through a more clearly defined, coordinated & integrated infrastructure.

An example of a collaborative effort regarding the three-tiered model work at the national level currently providing assistance to the Department is the Missouri RtI Collaborative. This group is comprised of several national technical assistance centers that are working in conjunction with Department leadership to assist in the development of supports and resources for academic RtI. Participating technical assistance centers include the NCRTI, North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), Center on Instruction (COI), Midwest Equity Assistance Center (MEAC), National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ), and the Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center (MC3) who is facilitating this collaborative. With support from the Missouri RtI Collaborative, a variety of evidence-based materials and

other resources with which to consider pre-K through grade 12 RtI implementation will be provided to the Department. The Centers are also providing expertise and assistance through document review.

Information related to three-tiered model webinars, professional development provided by NCRTI, research articles, tools, and resources that schools may find beneficial as they implement systems change models continue to be disseminated statewide through the Department listservs. Additionally, the Department website currently houses the Three-Tiered Model of Intervention website (http://www.dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/index.html) that references each of the three-tiered models. As one part of the plan for further enhancement of this site, Missouri is working with a regional workgroup facilitated by the Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center to develop a RtI Knowledge Base. The knowledge base will serve as a repository to house critical RtI information regarding research, implementation information, and other resources in an organized format.

A final draft of the Missouri RtI Guidance Document is nearing completion. The purpose of the guidance document is to provide an overview of RTI in Missouri and communicate Missouri's conceptual framework of the academic RTI model. Follow-up plans to the guidance document include an implementation manual that will provide more in-depth information to assist districts as they put RtI into practice.

To assist in gathering implementation information, five RtI development sites have been identified to contribute to the future implementation manual through practical district application efforts. These sites consist of twelve buildings within five Missouri school districts (8 elementary, 4 secondary). It should be noted that one of the secondary buildings in this group is located within a district that is scaling up as a part of the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Buildings participating in the development site work will receive resources and expertise vetted by the NCRTI and other national technical assistance centers. These buildings will utilize resources and expertise and agree to provide feedback and recommendations to the Department as the resources and tools necessary for statewide implementation are developed. Plans to secure a development site coordinator that will design, implement, and provide technical assistance to these sites are nearly finalized.

To determine the current level of statewide RtI implementation, dissemination of a self assessment survey developed by NCRTI for the purpose of gathering current RtI implementation data is underway. Beginning February 2011, NCRTI will work to assist the Department in modifying the RTI Framework Integrity Rubric into an online survey to be completed by March 2011. A plan is being developed to disseminate the online survey statewide to districts by April 2011. This data would inform the Department by creating a baseline with plans to re-administer each fall to measure growth. Additionally, this tool would also serve districts as an instrument to indicate level of readiness as well as reveal strengths, weaknesses, and highlight priority areas.

Additional future plans include development of a Higher Education Collaborative. Given that this work is in its preliminary stage, it is important to note that important groundwork is being put in place to engage Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) in the development of a Collaborative group to promote awareness and adoption of current practices in three-tiered models. Drs. Dan Reschly and Susan Smartt from Vanderbilt University have provided initial assistance in this area by presenting on evidence-based educational practices at the Missouri Association of College of Teacher Education (MACTE) leadership team meeting in April 2010.

**Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)]:** Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education in 2007, Missouri has been researching, developing, and implementing an integrated 3-tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes eleven essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, response to intervention and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. Districts spent 2008-09 planning and preparing and began implementation in 2009-10. In addition to

continuing to implement the model in the original pilot buildings, during the 2010-2011 school year, 9 of the 14 districts will be scaling up to additional buildings in the district to include 3 elementary buildings, 3 middle schools and 5 high schools. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. The results of this evaluation will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at www.mimschools.org.

**Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech Pilot:** During 2009-10, the enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. The project utilizes technology rich classrooms; Text-to-Speech software; and ongoing professional development to support and increase student achievement. In 2009-10, the Text to Speech/Speech to Text Software (TtS) Pilot project was expanded to Special Education teachers in 3 additional districts (10-12 classrooms) around the state with the eMINTS4All professional development program and the full complement of eMINTS4All technology resources for their classrooms. Students used technology in eMINTS or eMINTS4All classrooms. Collaborative opportunities fostered the creation of a shared knowledge base between general and special educators on the use of technology and TtS software. Current eMINTS/eMINTS4ALL teachers and special educators received training in the selection and use of appropriate assistive technology to achieve goals for students with disabilities. The Text-to-Speech software was provided and the collaborative opportunities extended in 3 additional districts (9-10 classrooms) for a total of six (6) districts, approximately 20 classrooms and 2,100 students. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the project.

**National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) Project:** To address student dropout data, a comprehensive school change process that includes professional development, data-based decision-making, collaboration, action planning, and technical assistance was implemented targeting schools with a dropout rate higher than the state average (4.3% in 2008-09). In 2009-10, Missouri partnered with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention strategies in high schools and middle feeder schools in eight communities representative of the state (urban/rural, small/medium/large). NDPC-SD provided six days of on-site training for district personnel. NDPC-SD facilitated school's efforts using data to identify risk factors for dropout and helped identify suitable interventions to address those factors. School dropout prevention teams created action plans to be implemented during the 2010-11 school year. Data submitted during the 2010-11 school year by participant schools will include retention rates, disciplinary infractions, academic failures and monthly attendance rates.

**Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The Transition Outcomes Project was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center with support from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Empowers local school Office of Special Educations to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs, and approaches.

The Department contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to all Department staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training.

Each year, Regional Professional Development Centers provide TOP training to participating districts in varying stages of implementation. This training includes assisting district teams in conducting IEP

reviews, analyzing results, reporting Indicator 13 data to district staff, developing and implementing action plans, and conducting follow-up IEP reviews.

**Training/Professional Development/Technical Assistance**

**Consultants:** The Department contracts with ten Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts through the support of the following consultant positions:

- Nineteen (19) Special Education Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans
- Twenty-four (24) Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Five (5) Special Education Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews, and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Three (3) Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Twenty (20) Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

**Project ACCESS:** Created in 1985, Project Access was one of the first state resource centers for autism in the nation. Project ACCESS at Missouri State University, funded 100% by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, provides autism resource information to public schools across Missouri serving students with autism and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD) in the form of on-site and telephone consultations, as well as support via the internet.

In addition, Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and trains professional credentialed individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). These trainings are offered to Missouri school district staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0-21, who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders and related disabilities. On-site child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and district staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs).

**MO Resources (MORE):** The DESE, in conjunction with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), supports a web-based system called Missouri Resources (MORE). This system provides information on topics related to the SPP Indicators. The topics are: Academic Achievement, Disproportionality, Dispute Resolution, Dropout, Early Childhood Outcomes, Early Intervening Services(EIS)/Three Tiered Models of Intervention(RtI), Graduation, LRE (preschool age), LRE (school age), Parent Involvement, Post-secondary Transition, and Suspension and Expulsion. Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-based Practice, Online Resource, and Definition. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address: http://more.northcentralrrc.org/.

**Standards-based IEPs:** The Standards-Based IEP Training is a one day (6 hour) training session for delivery by RPDC consultants for IEP teams. This training is conducted at least once annually in each region using the Standards-Based IEP Training Module. This module was developed collaboratively by the North Central Regional Resource Center, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, staff from three Missouri RPDCs and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Project Forum. The training was vetted by personnel at the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Standards-Based IEP training takes the participant through

the steps involved in developing a process of planning that improves the development of the IEP and helps the IEP team participants see the importance of connecting instructional goals to the general curriculum and grade-level standards.

**Targeted Technical Assistance to Districts:** The SPP Indicators include two recurring improvement activities. Those activities are:

- Targeted technical assistance to districts, and
- Providing online evidence-based and promising practices.

Targeted technical assistance to districts involves identifying districts most in need of improvement through data analysis or compliance monitoring and then assisting those districts, through the RPDC Consultants, with district-specific:

- Analysis of root causes in policies, procedures and practices
- Improvement planning or corrective action planning that addresses the district's specific needs
- Arranging for evidence-based professional development including, but not limited to:
    - Differentiated Instruction
    - Least Restrictive Environments (LRE)
    - Least Restrictive Environments for Early Childhood Special Education
    - Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)
    - Functional Behavior Plans
    - Behavioral Intervention Plans
    - Curriculum-based Measurement
    - Problem Solving
    - Measurable Goals
    - Co-teaching / Collaboration
    - Quality Eligibility Determination (QED)
    - Standards-based IEPs
- Arranging for other professional development as needed, including, but not limited to:
    - Compliance requirements
    - Accommodations training
    - Alternate Assessment training
    - Response to Intervention (RTI)
- Implementation of and problem-solving for a professional development plan
- Ongoing coaching and monitoring of progress

Compiling evidence-based and promising practices involves identifying a menu of evidence-based practices for use in developing improvement and professional development plans. This is done through the MORE website at http://more.northcentralrrc.org/.

**Evaluation**

E**valuation of SPP Improvement Activities:** The Office of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November of 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. Using this model, Office staff has worked to review and revise all existing Improvement Activities, align the activities with all contractual activities, and develop Action Plans with implementation and impact measures for every activity. Work on the evaluation plans and implementation measures is continuing during the 2010-2011 school year. The Office of Special Education is continuing to collaborate with the NCRRC in this work. Detailed Action Plans and evaluation measures may be found at the following website:
http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html.

**Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO NEW IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THIS SPP.**

**Indicator 1 –** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

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

**Measurement:** States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Office of Special Education at the Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, partner with the University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition and other agencies and individuals in a variety of improvement activities to increase understanding of the transition process and to lead to enhanced outcomes in the area of post-secondary transition.

Collaborative activities with the KU Transition Coalition include the following:

**The Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT)**: Formed in 2007, the purpose of the MITT is to increase interagency collaboration at the state, regional and local levels. The MITT meets quarterly to address data-driven goals for improvement and collaboration with the shared vision of improving outcomes for Missouri students (e.g., employment, independent living and postsecondary education). The MITT consists of membership from a variety of state agencies concerned with postsecondary transition and provides a venue to share information, network, and partner to coordinate professional development and activities. At this time, membership roles include the following agencies: The Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT), Missouri Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE), Missouri University of Science and Technology, Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation Services, Regional Professional Development Centers, Extended Employment/Sheltered Workshops, Workforce Development, Office of Special Education, Missouri Department of Corrections, as well as local-level transition coordinators and leadership. In 2009-2010 the MITT spearheaded an interdepartmental effort to decrease the dropout rate for both students with and without disabilities in Missouri. In collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), the MITT has increased its understanding of strategies to decrease dropout rates, including school teaming, data-based decision making about attendance and discipline, and school culture. Members of the MITT have attended trainings in Dropout Prevention, as well as discussed coordinating professional development efforts in this area.

**The Missouri Transition Liaison Program:** Developed in 2007 with the purpose of improving transition education and services in the State by identifying high performing district-level transition coordinators, secondary special education teachers & work study coordinators across Missouri. Currently Transition Liaisons meet three times a year to network, share information, plan trainings, and inform statewide transition activities.

Missouri Transition Liaisons devote time and energy to improve transition in Missouri through increased communication and collaboration with the Regional Professional Development Centers, the Transition Coalition, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

**The Missouri Transition Community of Practice (MO CoP):** The MoCoP, located at www.missouritransition.org, is a website designed to increase collaboration and information-sharing among transition professionals and consultants across Missouri. This website includes information on upcoming events, resources, links to other websites, discussion forums and hosts events such as "Ask the Expert which allows COP participants access to experts in the field of transition. There is a 12 day period during which participants can ask questions of the experts on the COP website.

**Community Transition Teams:** The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the KU Transition Coalition have partnered to recruit and develop Community Transition Teams (CTT) across Missouri. The goals of the Missouri Community Transition Teams are to:

- Provide an understanding of transition planning, services and research-based effective practices in transition as a framework for educators, students, families, administrators, interagency personnel, community partners, and employers, to ensure that they have the necessary knowledge and tools to improve post secondary outcomes for transitioning youth;
- Training and technical assistance in developing a strategic plan for community-wide transition systems is facilitated;
- Improve access to employment opportunities and other post-school activities as defined in Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and
- Elevate community awareness of, and commitment to, the improvement of post-secondary outcomes.

Community Transition Teams are comprised of a minimum of six members with at least one representative from each stakeholder group below:

- School-based transition coordinators and/or school personnel
- Family members of students with disabilities
- Vocational Rehabilitation Services staff.

**The Missouri Community Agency Search:** The Missouri Community Agency Search provides an easy, searchable database for Missouri transition stakeholders to identify community resources, agencies and information throughout the state which can provide services to youth with disabilities. All of the following types of agencies have been included in the Missouri Community Agency Search:

- Vocational Rehabilitation offices
- Centers for Independent Living (CILs)
- Public 2 year and 4 year colleges and universities
- Agencies providing services for people with Intellectual Disabilities

The Missouri Community Agency Search can be found at
http://transitioncoalition.org/transition/moca/agency_search.php

**Models of Success" in post secondary transition**: During 2007-08 the KU Transition Coalition and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) began identifying "models of success" in post-secondary transition. This initial identification was done through a nomination process. In August 2008, the Transition Coalition initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in providing transition services. This identification process included adapting a selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it was specific to Missouri. This process included a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model worked with the transition coalition to create a description of the program. The Missouri Community of Practice provides graphic and text information about the models on www.transitioncoalition.org.

**Missouri-specific professional development:** Through a collaborative effort between the Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and the KU Transition Coalition, three online independent-study training modules have been developed for transition professionals in Missouri. They include case studies, performance-based assessments, and resources on transition compliance, best practices, and transition assessment, and they are available at no cost on the Transition Coalition website.

**KU transition short courses:** Five month-long transition seminars are offered to Missouri transition professionals through the University of Kansas (KU). Scholarships are provided by the Department through a rubric-rated application process. The seminar series is co-taught by Drs. Amy Gaumer Erickson and Sally Morgan Smith, instructors who hold doctoral degrees with an emphasis in transition and who have been trained in providing high-quality online professional development. The instructors collaborated closely with the Department to tailor the content, ensuring that state-level articles, videos, websites, and performance-measures are incorporated into each seminar. The five seminars include:

- Introduction to Transition Education and Services
- Family Involvement and Student Involvement in Transition
- Transition Assessment
- Preparing Students for Employment and Postsecondary Education
- Interagency Collaboration during Transition Planning

The research-based transition seminar series was developed to address the *Transition Specialist Competencies* as outlined by the Council for Exceptional Children, Division on Career Development and Transition (2000).

Collaborative activities with other agencies/individuals include the following:

**Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The Transition Outcomes Project was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center with support from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Empowers local school Office of Special Educations to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs, and approaches.
- The Department contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to all Department staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training.

Each year districts are recruited to participate in the project and are trained on the TOPs process. Existing TOPs districts are also supported through follow-up sessions and technical assistance.

**National Dropout Prevention Center Initiative:** In 2009-10, Missouri partnered with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention strategies in high schools and middle feeder schools in eight communities representative of the state (urban/rural, small/medium/large). NDPC-SD provided six days of on-site training for district personnel. NDPC-SD facilitated school's efforts using data to identify risk factors for dropout and helped identify suitable interventions to address those factors. School dropout prevention teams created action plans to be implemented during the 2010-11 school year.

**MPACT Self-determination Module:** The Department of Education and the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)—Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) collaborated in the 2009-2010 school year to create a self-determination module designed for students as they move through the transition process. The module, Be-Determined was developed by MPACT, vetted by the Department and is used by MPACT staff to present to students and parents.

**Missouri Option Program:** The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who could complete Missouri high school graduation requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits

needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. The Office of Special Education is working with the Office of College and Career Readiness to better disseminate information about the program and collect data on the districts offering the program and the impact on students with disabilities.

**Missouri Connections:** In 2008 the Office of Special Education began to collaborate with the Office of College and Career Readiness to provide information to consultants, practitioners and other transition professionals with regard to Missouri Connections and its relationship to the transition process. Missouri Connections is an online resource sponsored by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education that takes career planning to a higher level. Designed to guide students through the career planning process, the system provides activities for career awareness, provides students opportunities for college and career exploration, and directs preparation for transition into postsecondary education and the world of work. Students (grades 7-16), parents, guidance counselors, and educators can use the online system at no charge at: www.missouriconnections.org. During the past two summer Transition Institutes, the Office of Special Education has showcased Missouri Connections. Additionally the RPDC Transition Consultants, Missouri Transition Liaisons, and all cohorts of the Community Transition teams receive Missouri Connections training.

**RPDC Transition Consultants:** Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance to teachers and school teams within each region of Missouri. All school districts have access to a RPDC Consultant specializing in transition.

Over the past three years, the Transition Coalition has developed four transition workshop packages for RPDC Consultants. Incorporating a train-the-trainer model, consultants provided input into the training topic and materials, observed the training being conducted, discussed adaptations to the training, and then provided the training within their regions. Consultants also participate in an online community of practice for further discussion and to share resources.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

| Graduation Rates | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Students with Disabilities | | | All Students | | |
| Year | Number of Graduates | Number of Graduates & Dropouts | Graduation Rate | Number of Graduates | Graduation Rate | Gap (All – Spec Ed) |
| 2000-2001 | 4,995 | 8,146 | 61.3% | 54,181 | 81.4% | 20.1% |
| 2001-2002 | 5,402 | 8,226 | 65.7% | 54,513 | 82.4% | 16.7% |
| 2002-2003 | 5,775 | 8,215 | 70.3% | 56,906 | 84.4% | 14.1% |
| 2003-2004 | 6,030 | 8,499 | 70.9% | 57,988 | 85.5% | 14.6% |
| 2004-2005 | 6,001 | 8,369 | 71.7% | 57,495 | 85.7% | 14.0% |

Sources: All Students data from datawarehouse table Summary_Building as of 11/21/05.
Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/21/05.
Notes: Data does not include Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) because these students were not included in reporting for all students.

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts) x 100
- All Students Graduation Rate: (Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Calculations differ for students with disabilities and all students due to the following:

| Difference in Calculations/ Reporting | Students with Disabilities | All Students |
|---|---|---|
| Collection method | Screen 12 of Core Data by district and age | Screen 13 of Core Data by building and grade level |
| Exiters Reported | Students on the district's Special Education child count prior to exit during the school year | All students exiting during the school year |
| Graduation rate calculations | (Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts)) x 100.<br>Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead.<br>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP | (Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100<br>Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level<br>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits or by achieving goals on IEP |
| Dropout rate calculations | (Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21) x 100. Total dropouts includes exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Max Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out. Average enrollment not collected for students with disabilities, uses 14-21 child count as of December 1 instead. | (Number of dropouts divided by average enrollment) x 100<br>Total dropouts is same as for students with disabilities<br>Average enrollment is collected for all students |

Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) are excluded from the baseline data and calculations above since students in those facilities can earn GEDs but not regular diplomas, and GED recipients are counted in the dropout category. Therefore, in order to look at data that is most representative of regular school districts, their data are excluded from the graduation and dropout calculations shown here and for setting future targets.

Trend data for the past five years show that graduation rates have been increasing for both students with disabilities and all students. Over the past five years, the gap between students with disabilities and all students has decreased by more than 6%.

Graduation rate data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years. Public reporting of special education data will include graduation rates as described above for every district every year. Graduation rates for all students are publicly reported on DESE's website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/.

**Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2011**

Missouri is not yet able to calculate the graduation rate as established under the ESEA for any groups of students. Data collection changes were made in 2007-08 to collect a "first-time freshman" flag which will allow the state to begin using the ESEA graduation rate calculation for the 2010-11 graduates.

Targets for this indicator have been revised in the SPP to align with Missouri's ESEA Accountability Workbook. The graduation rate target statement in the workbook states, "Schools between 75 and 85 percent expected to improve at least two percentage points per year; schools with rates < 75 percent expected to improve at least five percentage points per year." Missouri has applied this target statement to the statewide graduation rate for students with disabilities (79.2%) to determine annual, numerical targets for 2010-11 through 2012-13.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 73.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities |
| **2006-2007** | 74.0% |
| **2007-2008** | 75.0% |
| **2008-2009** | 74.0% |
| **2009-2010** | 74.5% |
| **2010-2011** | 81.2% |
| **2011-2012** | 83.2% |
| **2012-2013** | 85.0% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) in order to establish a collaborative interagency group which will develop and oversee the implementation of a coordinated state-wide plan for post secondary transition programs and services. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff and KU | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.2 Manage and support a Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field, and interact with other educators throughout the state. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff and KU | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.3 Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option program | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, Office of Special Education of Career Education | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.4 Recruit and support transition liaisons in all RPDC regions to increase state capacity to provide training and information in the area of post secondary transition | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, KU | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.5 Recruit and support Community Transition Teams in all RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of best practices. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, KU, Transition Liaisons, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.6 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.8 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, KU | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.9 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on post secondary transition | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 1.10 Support scale-up of the Transition to College Program to assist students with disabilities in accessing and succeeding in post-secondary education | 2011/12-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Added 2/11 |
| 1.11 Support scale-up of National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) program to additional districts in the state | 2011/12-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, NDPC-SD staff | Active Added 2/11 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED (SEE INDICATOR 1).**

**Indicator 2 –** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school

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

**Measurement:** States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

See Overview of Issue in Indicator 1.

Missouri uses dropout numbers as part of the denominator in graduation rate calculations; therefore, the graduation and dropout rates are related. However, the denominators for the two calculations are different resulting in two rates that are related, but cannot be summed. Graduation and dropout rates are both considered when assessing secondary transition issues.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

| Dropout Rates | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Students with Disabilities | | | All Students | | Gap (All – Spec Ed) |
| Year | Number of Dropouts | Child Count Age 14-22 | Drop Out Rate | Number of Dropouts | Drop Out Rate | |
| 2000-2001 | 3,151 | 42,291 | 7.5% | 11,046 | 4.2% | 3.3% |
| 2001-2002 | 2,824 | 44,000 | 6.4% | 9,554 | 3.6% | 2.8% |
| 2002-2003 | 2,440 | 45,505 | 5.4% | 8,994 | 3.3% | 2.1% |
| 2003-2004 | 2,469 | 45,939 | 5.4% | 9,065 | 3.4% | 2.0% |
| 2004-2005 | 2,368 | 46,188 | 5.1% | 10,341 | 3.8% | 1.3% |

Sources: All Students Data from datawarehouse table Summary_Building as of 11/21/05. Students with Disabilities Data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/21/05.
Notes: Data does not include Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC) and Office of Special Education of Youth Services (DYS) because these students were not included in reporting for all students.

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-22
- All Students Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Average enrollment
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

See table for Indicator 1

Dropout rates for students with disabilities have decreased significantly over the past five years. Gaps in dropout rates between all students and students with disabilities have also decreased.

Dropout rate data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years. Public reporting of special education data will include dropout rates for every district every year. Dropout rates for all students are publicly reported on DESE's website at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 4.7% dropout rate for students with disabilities |
| **2006-2007** | 4.5% |
| **2007-2008** | 4.3% |
| **2008-2009** | 5.0% |
| **2009-2010** | 4.9% |
| **2010-2011** | 4.8% |
| **2011-2012** | 4.8% |
| **2012-2013** | 4.8% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

See Indicator 1—Graduation Rates

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO OF THE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED.**

**Indicator 3 –** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

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

**Measurement:**

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.

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

C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri's statewide assessment, the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), is administered at grades 3-8. Communication Arts and Mathematics are assessed at grades 3-8, and Science is assessed at grades 5 and 8. End-of-Course (EOC) assessments are administered at the completion of the following courses: Algebra I, Biology, English II, and Government.

For the small percentage of students who cannot participate in the MAP even with accommodations, the MAP-Alternate (MAP-A) is provided. The MAP-A is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet grade level and eligibility criteria. This assessment is administered at grades 3-8, 10, and 11. Communication Arts is assessed at grades 3-8 and 11, and Mathematics is administered at grades 3-8 and 10. Science is assessed at grades 5, 8, and 11.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, address it through an objective and strategies. In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan.

Missouri has an on-site monitoring process that targets elementary achievement as a priority area. Department staff conducts on-site monitoring reviews, which include data analysis, file reviews, and interviews with students, parents, and district staff. Following the reviews, districts are provided reports with review findings and resources for use in improvement planning.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

OSEP requires that all states report baseline data for 2004-05. Missouri is including these data to satisfy the requirements; however, these data will not correspond to the revised Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals that will be set in conjunction with the setting of standards for the new grade level assessments being implemented in 2006.

**A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup.**

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2005 were 26.6% for Communication Arts and 17.5% for Mathematics. The proficiency goals for 2004 were 20.4% for Communication Arts and 10.3% for Mathematics.

**Communication Arts – Grades 3, 7 & 11**

| | IEP District Met w/ n* | Total District with n* | Percent Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 34 | 111 | 30.6% |
| 2005 | 23 | 112 | 20.5% |

**Mathematics – Grades 4, 8 & 10**

| | IEP District Met w/ n* | Total District with n* | Percent Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 90 | 116 | 77.6% |
| 2005 | 58 | 114 | 50.9% |

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes is 50.

**<u>Updated baseline data submitted February 1, 2007 SPP</u>**

| Year | Subject | District MET for IEP Subgroup | Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup | Percent Met for IEP Subgroup |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2005 | Communication Arts | 23 | 112 | 20.5% |
| | Mathematics | 57 | 116 | 49.1% |
| | Combined | 20 | 123 | 16.3% |

Note that the data for Mathematics has changed slightly since submission of the SPP in 12/05.

**B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.**

**2005 MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with IEPs**

| | Total | Regular MAP Assessment | MAP-Alternate Assessment | Participation Rate | Absent | Not Assessed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comm Arts Grade 3 | 10,264 | 9,992 | 0 | 97.3% | 25 | 247 |
| Comm Arts Grade 7 | 10,789 | 10,412 | 0 | 96.5% | 114 | 263 |
| Comm Arts Grade 11 | 7,525 | 6,991 | 300 | 96.9% | 168 | 66 |
| Comm Arts Total | 28,578 | 27,395 | 300 | 96.9% | 307 | 576 |
| | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Grade 4 | 10,403 | 10,012 | 309 | 99.2% | 21 | 61 |
| Mathematics Grade 8 | 10,913 | 10,363 | 368 | 98.3% | 120 | 62 |
| Mathematics Grade 10 | 8,971 | 8,520 | 0 | 95.0% | 215 | 236 |
| Mathematics Total | 30,287 | 28,895 | 677 | 97.6% | 356 | 359 |

Students included in the "Not Assessed" category include students who were determined eligible to take the alternate assessment by the IEP team, but who did not submit a portfolio for one of two reasons:

1) In 2004 and 2005, the MAP Alternate (MAP-A) was assessed at grades 4, 8 and 11. Previously, the MAP-A was assessed at ages 9, 13 and 17. When the DESE made the transition from age eligibility to grade eligibility, students that were grade eligible in 2004 or 2005 were not required to participate in the assessment if they had been assessed in one of the prior two years.
2) In 2005, the MAP-A was not required for grades 3, 7 and 10 so any student eligible to take the alternate assessment in those grades were not assessed. New assessments for mathematics and communication arts will be in place in spring 2006 for grades 3-8 and high school assessments at grade 11 for communication arts and grade 10 for mathematics. Therefore, all MAP-A eligible students will be assessed annually beginning in 2006.

**C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.**

"Proficiency" includes the top two of five achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP assessments, and Proficient for the MAP-Alternate.

**2005 MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities**

| | Total | Proficient - Regular Assessment | Proficient - Alternate Assessment | Proficiency Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comm Arts Grade 3 | 10,264 | 2,142 | 0 | 20.9% |
| Comm Arts Grade 7 | 10,789 | 723 | 0 | 6.7% |
| Comm Arts Grade 11 | 7,525 | 122 | 210 | 4.4% |
| Comm Arts Total | 28,578 | 2,987 | 210 | 11.2% |
| | | | | |
| Mathematics Grade 4 | 10,403 | 2,473 | 217 | 25.9% |
| Mathematics Grade 8 | 10,913 | 200 | 284 | 4.4% |
| Mathematics Grade 10 | 8,971 | 153 | 0 | 1.7% |
| Mathematics Total | 30,287 | 2,826 | 501 | 11.0% |

See note on MAP-Alternate testing above.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

The number and percent of districts meeting AYP goals decreased from 2004 to 2005, however, the proficiency goals increased by 6-7%. Any improvement in scores made by districts did not keep up with the increased proficiency goals. The targets presented below show minimal improvement, whereas any increase at all is unlikely due to the increase in the proficiency goals needed in order to have 100% proficiency by 2014.

Data show the percent of students with disabilities participating in the MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments has been over 95% for the past three years and over 97% in 2005.

MAP Assessment data have been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years and includes participation and performance data for students with disabilities. AYP subgroup data and status are publicly reported on DESE's website. Additional public reporting of special education data will include assessment participation and performance data for every district every year.

**<u>Update to SPP submitted February 1, 2007</u>**

Due to the implementation of annual grade level assessments in 2006 for grades 3 through 8 and a high school assessment as well as state legislation requiring the use of four achievement levels, the proficiency targets for AYP were revised for 2005-2006 and all subsequent school years. The following targets have been revised accordingly. Due to these changes, and OSEP's instruction that the AYP target should reflect a combined AYP determination, the targets for percent of districts meeting AYP are

being revised. For both AYP and proficiency, the 2006 data reported in the APR will be considered the new baseline. The targets for participation are being changed from 100% to 95% to correspond with AYP determinations.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | Percent of districts meeting AYP: 30%<br>Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 34.7% Math – 26.6% |
| **2006-2007** | District AYP: 33%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 42.9% Math – 35.8% |
| **2007-2008** | District AYP: 34%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 51.0% Math – 45.0% |
| **2008-2009** | District AYP: 35%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 59.2% Math – 54.1% |
| **2009-2010** | District AYP: 36%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 67.4% Math – 63.3% |
| **2010-2011** | District AYP: 37%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 75.5% Math – 72.5% |
| **2011-2012** | District AYP: 37%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 83.7% Math – 81.7% |
| **2012-2013** | District AYP: 37%<br>Participation: CA -- 95% Math – 95%<br>Proficiency: CA – 91.8% Math – 90.8% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts. | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, eMINTS Staff | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.2 Develop and pilot an integrated three tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective three tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers | Active Revised 2/10 |

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.3 Provide information to various stakeholders on three-tiered models of student support | 2010/11-2012/13 | DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers | Active Added 2/10 Revised 2/11 |
| 3.4 Provide training/pd to districts through the RPDC consultants on three-tiered models of student support | 2010/11-2012/13 | DESE Staff, RPDC consultants and directors, National Centers | Active Added 2/10 Revised 2/11 |
| 3.5 Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS). | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.6 Support through Project ACCESS the development of services and programs to increase school districts' capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, Project ACCESS Staff | Active Added 2/10 |
| 3.7 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.8 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.9 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.10 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans. | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE AND TO CLARIFY THE PROCESS USED FOR EACH PART OF THE INDICATOR (A & B). PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 4 –** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4:**

The Department collects disciplinary actions for all students in order to meet federal requirements for Gun Free Schools and IDEA, and state requirements for Safe Schools. The data collection includes every suspension/expulsion and the number of days of removal for each along with student demographic information.

**Definition of Significant Discrepancy:** Missouri utilizes the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for both Indicators 4A and 4B. As described below, a district would be found to have a significant discrepancy in suspension expulsion rates if the district has a ratio greater than 4.0 (mean + one standard deviation for 2007-08 data), with adjustments for low discipline rates, for two consecutive years. Ratio calculations are described below under section entitled

This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every district in the state.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4A:**

Disciplinary actions for 2004-05 were reported on an incident level for any incident resulting in ten or more days of suspension or expulsion. From this incident-level report, the Office of Special Education

reports to OSEP the number of children with disabilities who received disciplinary action on Table 5 of the Annual Report of Children Served. Comparisons between the data reported in the OSEP tables and the incident-level data show very little difference in proportions by disability category or race, therefore, the following analysis uses the incident-level data rather than the derived student-level data.

States must look at discrepancies either:

A. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities BETWEEN districts
   - Compare District X's rate to District Y's rate

B. In suspension/expulsion rates for students with and without disabilities WITHIN districts
   - Compare District X's rates for students with disabilities to District X's rates for nondisabled students

The Department will use Method B because this will eliminate the need for analysis of policies, procedures and practices between districts. Discipline incidents include any incident resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions count as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for All Students (Number of incidents for all students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Any ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation is considered a significant discrepancy.

With this SPP/APR for 2009-10, Missouri had changed the methodology used to identify districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsions rates. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

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

Previously, the mean and standard deviation of the district ratios was calculated, and districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation were considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The new methodology for evaluating the data for 2008-09 and future years utilizes a set cut point rather than the mean + one standard deviation to determine if a discrepancy exists. The set cut point eliminates the impact of outlier districts as well as potential changes to the mean and standard deviation if districts update their discipline data submissions.

The cut point used for Indicator 4A is 4.0. This compares to a mean + one standard deviation of 4.13 for data from the 2008-09 school year, so is a more rigorous cut point than would have been used under the previous methodology.

**Baseline Data for Indicator 4A for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and All Students for 2004-05**

| | (A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD | (B) Count of Discipline Incidents for All Students | (C) IEP Child Count Ages 3-22 | (D) Total Enrollment | (E) Incident Rate per 100 SWD | (F) Incident Rate per 100 Students | (G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Districts | 2,065 | 9,714 | 131,497 | 888,102 | 1.57 | 1.09 | 1.44 |
| Districts with >4 Incidents for Students with IEPs | 1,800 | 7,458 | 72,024 | 486,684 | 2.50 | 1.53 | 1.63 |
| Mean Ratio | | | | | | | 2.33 |
| Standard Deviation | | | | | | | 1.17 |
| Mean + 1 Standard Deviation | | | | | | | 3.50 |

Calculations:
E = (A / C) x 100 meaning, on average, there are 2.50 incidents per 100 students with disabilities
F = (B / D) x 100 meaning, on average, there are 1.53 incidents per 100 students
G = E / F
Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data

**Ratio of Discipline Rates for Students with Disabilities to Discipline Rates for All Students**

| Year | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean + 1 Std. Dev. | Districts with Sig. Disc. | Total Districts | Percent of Districts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2004-05 | 2.33 | 1.17 | 3.50 | 10 | 524 | 1.9% |

Data Source: District-reported data on Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)
Discipline Rate = Number of Discipline Incidents / Number of Students

**Discussion of Baseline Data for Indicator 4A:** Through the analysis of data for students with disabilities and all students, ten districts, 1.9% of all districts, were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. Discipline data show disproportionate percentages by race, however special education data is somewhat less disproportionate than that of all students.

For Part A of this indicator, the Department will identify significant discrepancies as described above, while attempting to lower the average ratio of discipline rates of students with disabilities to all students within districts. Discipline data has been included in the Special Education District Profiles for several years and includes discipline rates for students with disabilities and all students. Public reporting of data will include these discipline rates and the ratio for every district every year.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for Indicator 4B:**

Missouri is using a method identical to Indicator 4A to determine if districts have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates by race. The same methodology used for all students (described above and in the APR) was conducted for each racial/ethnic group. The same cut point of 4.0 is being used for both Indicator 4A and 4B.

**Baseline Data for Indicator 4B for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

**Discipline Summary Based on 2008-09 Data**

| | Black | White | Asian, Native American, Hispanic |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of districts | 561 | 561 | 561 |
| Districts with five or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations) | 43 | 72 | 0 |
| Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| (a) Districts with second year of identification **(significant discrepancy)** | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (b) Districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **(b) as a percent of districts** | **0.0%** | **0.0%** | **N/A** |

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file

**Unduplicated districts excluded from calculations: based on the table above a total of 87 districts met the minimum "n" size for one or more racial/ethnic categories. This resulted in 474 (561 – 87) unduplicated districts excluded from calculations.**

**Discussion of Baseline Data for Indicator 4B:** When data are examined by race/ethnicity, only a small number of districts meet the minimum cell size and of those, very few exceed the ratio cut point of 4.0 as demonstrated in the table above. The state has been examining discipline data by race for several years, and there is very little consistency from one year to the other, largely due to the lower number of discipline incidents when the data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity. All of these factors result in no districts being identified as having significant discrepancies in discipline rates by race/ethnicity and, therefore, no reviews were conducted.

| | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | A: 1.7% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates<br>B: NA |
| **2006-2007** | A: 1.5% B: NA |
| **2007-2008** | A: 1.2% B: NA |
| **2008-2009** | A: 1.0% B: NA |
| **2009-2010** | A: 0.8% B: NA |
| **2010-2011** | A: 0.5% B: 0% |
| **2011-2012** | A: 0.5% B: 0% |
| **2012-2013** | A: 0.5% B: 0% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicators 4A and 4B:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 4.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 4.3 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 4.4 Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS). | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Added 2/10 |
| 4.5 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 5 –** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri's special education placements for school-aged students with disabilities continue to show increases in the percent of students being educated with their nondisabled peers and is generally better than the nation as a whole.

Quality placement decisions and least restrictive environments are emphasized in a variety of ways:

- Special Education District Profiles report trend data on educational placements
- Compliance calls (met/not met) on placement decisions are included in monitoring reports
- Focused monitoring reviews are looking closely at LRE decisions through file reviews and interviews
- Analysis of district data conducted by LEA staff and RPDC Consultants is identifying LRE as an issue in some districts and improvement plans are addressing the issues
- Use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction) is supported through improvement grants, web-based information and training and regional professional development activities
- Training and professional development is provided through the RPDC Consultants on the following to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate:
    - Differentiated instruction
    - Three-tiered models
    - Co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers
    - Standards-based IEPs

- Targeted technical assistance is provided to districts 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
- Information is provided on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator (MORE website)

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Special Education Placement Data for ages 5K-21**

| | 2002-2003 | | 2003-2004 | | 2004-2005 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| **Inside Reg Class ≥ 80%%** | **76,091** | **56.74%** | **76,805** | **57.67%** | **76,674** | **58.05%** |
| Inside Reg Class 40-79% | 37,651 | 28.08% | 36,709 | 27.56% | 36,006 | 27.26% |
| **Inside Reg Class < 40%** | **15,861** | **11.83%** | **15,045** | **11.30%** | **14,741** | **11.16%** |
| Private Separate (Day) Fac. | 889 | 0.66% | 931 | 0.70% | 1,004 | 0.76% |
| Public Separate (Day) Fac. | 1,717 | 1.28% | 1,846 | 1.39% | 1,890 | 1.43% |
| Homebound/Hospital | 560 | 0.42% | 589 | 0.44% | 527 | 0.40% |
| Private Residential Facility | 41 | 0.03% | 49 | 0.04% | 25 | 0.02% |
| State Operated Schools | 1,229 | 0.92% | 1,208 | 0.91% | 1,207 | 0.91% |
| Public Residential Facility | 57 | 0.04% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| **Total Separate** | **4,493** | **3.35%** | **4,623** | **3.47%** | **4,653** | **3.52%** |
| Total School Age | 134,096 | 100.00% | 133,182 | 100.00% | 132,074 | 100.00% |

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Data on least restrictive environments show that Missouri has been moving towards less restrictive placements over the last several years. The targets presented below continue this movement.

**Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2008**

Targets for 2007-08 and subsequent years for the percent of students inside regular class at least 80% of the day (removed from regular class < 21%) have been revised due to the change in data collection which removes parentally-placed private school students and students in correctional facilities from the targeted categories.

**Update for SPP submitted February 1, 2009**

Targets for 2008-09 and subsequent years have been revised.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class ≥ 80% of the day: 59%<br>Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 11.0%<br>Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.50% |
| **2006-2007** | ≥ 80%: 60.0% < 40%: 10.9% Other Settings: 3.45% |
| **2007-2008** | ≥ 80%: 59.0% < 40%: 10.8% Other Settings: 3.40% |
| **2008-2009** | ≥ 80%: 58.5% < 40%: 10.4% Other Settings: 3.60% |
| **2009-2010** | ≥ 80%: 59.0% < 40%: 10.3% Other Settings: 3.55% |
| **2010-2011** | ≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50% |
| **2011-2012** | ≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50% |
| **2012-2013** | ≥ 80%: 59.5% < 40%: 10.2% Other Settings: 3.50% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1 Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction). | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 5.2 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for differentiated instruction, three-tiered models and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, National Centers | Active Added 2/10 |
| 5.3 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. | 2008/09-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 5.4 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 5.5 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**TEXT FROM PREVIOUS SPP UNDER THE OVERVIEW SECTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, NO REPORTING IS REQUIRED FOR THIS INDICATOR FOR THE FEBRUARY 1, 2011 SPP.**

**Indicator 6 –** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Text from the previous SPP under this section has been removed. Per OSEP instructions, no reporting is required for this indicator for the February 1, 2011 SPP.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):**

Per OSEP instructions, no reporting is required for this indicator for the February 1, 2011 SPP.

**Discussion of Baseline Data, Targets and Improvement Activities:**

Not applicable

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/2010 SPP. PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). PER OSEP REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESPONSE TABLE, TARGETS FOR 2010-11 HAVE BEEN REVISED TO REFLECT IMPROVEMENT OVER THE BASELINE.**

**Indicator 7 –** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education serves as the Lead Agency for Part C (First Steps) as well as Part B of IDEA. In order to begin the process of gathering data on these specific early childhood outcomes, Missouri convened representatives from both the First Steps and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) programs October 26-27, 2005, with organizational help from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). This work group of Parts C and B administrators met with staff at the Department to develop a pilot process on early childhood outcomes, facilitated by Robin Rooney and Anne Lucas of NECTAC. Participants represented all regions of the state, including urban, suburban and rural communities.

In January through June 2006, three models of determining early childhood outcomes were piloted in a number of school districts/SPOE regions across the state. In spring 2006, the districts and SPOEs met to discuss the pilot and to give recommendations for full implementation of the early childhood outcomes collection.

Decisions for statewide implementation included the following:

- First Steps and ECSE should use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been or will be compiled.
- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) would be designed to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html
- The MOSS would be used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to DESE
- Each eligible child entering First Steps or ECSE beginning October 2006 must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least 6 months
- No sampling will be used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed
- Entry and exit data is to be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 will be determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely"
- All entry and exit data collected during a given year will be submitted electronically to DESE at the end of that year
- The outcome status for each child will be determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings

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

**Progress Data for FFY 2008 (2008-09):**

| | A: Positive social-emotional skills | | B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills | | C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Did not improve functioning | 70 | 1.6% | 86 | 2.0% | 70 | 1.6% |
| b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable | 155 | 3.7% | 144 | 3.4% | 199 | 4.7% |
| c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers | 1664 | 39.2% | 2217 | 52.3% | 1403 | 33.1% |
| d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable | 1140 | 26.9% | 1202 | 28.3% | 1203 | 28.4% |
| e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable | 1214 | 28.6% | 594 | 14.0% | 1368 | 32.2% |
| Total | 4243 | 100.0% | 4243 | 100.0% | 4243 | 100.0% |

**Summary Statements for FFY 2008 (2008-09):**

| | A: Positive social-emotional skills | B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills | C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet 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 | 92.6% | 93.7% | 90.6% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited. | 55.5% | 42.3% | 60.6% |

These data are derived from the comparison of entry to exit ratings for children who entered ECSE either during the pilot of 2005-06 or after October 2006 for all other districts and exited during 2008-09 after being in the program at least six months.

**Valid and Reliable Data:** Regional trainings were held across the state in the fall of 2006 for both First Steps and ECSE personnel. Training materials, including PowerPoint presentations, data tools, reporting forms and Q&A documents were posted on the web and updated annually to clarify procedures. Additionally, ongoing technical assistance has been available through the Office of Special Education.

The ECO workgroup, consisting of Department staff, district ECSE personnel, and a Regional Professional Development Center consultant, conducted an analysis of 2008-09 ECO data. Due to variances between and among First Steps and ECSE data, the ECO workgroup determined a need to review the procedures used across the state to gather ECO data. As a result of the review, an “ECO Administration and Reporting Guidelines” document was developed and a statewide training held November 2009. The purpose of the guidelines and training was to gain a thorough understanding of the ECO administration process in both First Steps and ECSE in order to accurately measure the performance of infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities and confidently collect and share data.

In addition, a common identifier system is being used for both First Steps and ECSE, which, in future years, will allow for comparisons between the ratings for the two programs. That information will be useful in ensuring comparable data and ratings both within and between the two programs.

These activities, including training, technical assistance and data comparability checks, have helped to improve, and will continue to improve, the reliability and validity of this new data collection.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Summary Statement 1 | Summary Statement 2 |
| **2005-2006 through 2008-2009** | | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| **2009-2010** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 83.3%<br>84.3%<br>81.5% | 49.9%<br>38.1%<br>54.5% |
| **2010-2011** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 92.7%<br>93.8%<br>90.7% | 55.6%<br>42.4%<br>60.7% |
| **2011-2012** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 92.7%<br>93.8%<br>90.7% | 55.6%<br>42.4%<br>60.7% |
| **2012-2013** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 92.7%<br>93.8%<br>90.7% | 55.6%<br>42.4%<br>60.7% |

The proposed targets for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 were developed by a Department/stakeholder workgroup after a thorough review of the data. The proposed targets were finalized with input from, support of, and approval by the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE). The Department/stakeholder group, as well as the SEAP and MoCASE felt that with complete data for only one year, and the current lack of alignment in the administration of the assessment and determination of ratings on the outcomes between the two programs (ECSE—Section 619 and First Steps—Part C), that the baseline data from only one year does not reflect a true picture of Missouri. Therefore, it was recommended by the stakeholder groups that we identify targets that are believed to be more reflective of Missouri's performance, even though they are lower than the baseline data for 2008-2009. We will revisit this data in the coming months and anticipate revising the targets for 2010-2011. In the interim we have been conducting extensive training on early childhood outcomes and have placed special emphasis on the alignment between the Part C and Part B programs; stakeholders have been very responsive to and appreciative of this training. Training evaluations have indicated a greater level of understanding of the ECO process (administration and data collection and reporting) in both Part B and C.

Update for February 1, 2011 SPP

Per OSEP instructions in the Missouri Response Table, targets for 2010-2011 have been revised to show improvement over the baseline. Targets have also been extended for two additional years. The revised and extended targets were finalized with input from, support of, and approval by the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE).

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.1 Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (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 | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 7.2 Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 7.3 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 7.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). ONE NEW IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS SPP.**

**Indicator 8** – Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 523 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. School district reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 523 districts as well as other responsible public agencies. These reviews include the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys are used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The complete parent survey can be found at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf. The surveys are sent to all parents in the school districts.

The parent survey was revised for use in the 4th cycle of MSIP by Department staff and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA). The Office of Special Education worked with the MSIP staff and OSEDA to have question(s) added to the parent survey for 2006-07 that address this SPP indicator. Data will be gathered from all districts throughout the monitoring cycle. The parent survey includes demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others. These data will be used to determine if the responses are a representative sample or to derive a representative sample for the state.

OSEDA has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from survey data each year, based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian; Majority=White). The first step is to determine the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divide them into three groups. The second step is to determine the overall student enrollments, as well as the Minority/Majority enrollments at the state level, within each of the above FRL categories. This produces a stratified sampling scheme at the state level which contains six cells:

| FRL | Minority | Majority |
|---|---|---|
| Less Than 33% | cell 1 | cell 2 |
| 33% to 54% | cell 3 | cell 4 |
| 55% or More | cell 5 | cell 6 |

A sampling target is selected, and that number of respondents is assigned to one of the six cells by randomly selecting responses until the required number of responses needed for each cell is obtained.

Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) offers information via the web and a toll free phone line as well as training sessions throughout the state. MPACT serves parents of children with all disabilities and works with public and private agencies, parent groups, professional organizations and advocacy groups. Staff and volunteers are located throughout Missouri. The Department and MPACT have collaborated on the development and delivery of training in the areas of transition and technical assistance bulletins and parents' guides. This training and information assist parents in understanding special education and their child's disability and needs. The Department and MPACT are currently offering IEP Facilitation training for district IEP team personnel.

RPDC Consultants are available to assist districts/buildings regarding parent participation. In order to support these activities, the Office of Special Education collaborates with stakeholders to identify and promote successful models of parent involvement.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

The MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire contains two items directly related to this indicator:

- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement.
- The school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with the SPP indicator. The following table shows the rates of agreement with both questions for parents of students with disabilities and parents of nondisabled students.

| | Agree | Not Agree | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parents of Students with Disabilities | 296 (76.49%) | 91 (23.51%) | 387 (100%) |
| Parents of Nondisabled Students | 3548 (72.88%) | 1320 (27.12%) | 4868 (100%) |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Since the MSIP parent survey was only piloted in one district during 2005-06, the data above only reflects responses from that one district. While that district is generally considered to be somewhat representative of the state, it is unknown how the responses on these two questions will compare to statewide data. Targets have been established based on this data. These data are being gathered in conjunction with MSIP accreditation reviews, therefore public reporting of data will include data from districts in their MSIP review year. All districts will have data collected during the five year cycle of MSIP, 2006-07 through 2010-11, which is contained within the six year SPP reporting cycle.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | Not applicable |
| **2006-2007** | 77% of parents of students with disabilities will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities |
| **2007-2008** | 72.5% |
| **2008-2009** | 75.0% |
| **2009-2010** | 77.5% |
| **2010-2011** | 80.0% |
| **2011-2012** | 80.0% |
| **2012-2013** | 80.0% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8.1 Develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement. | 2010/11-2011/12 | Office of Special Education | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.2 Support Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers. | 2008/09-2012/13 | Office of Special Education. MPACT | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 8.3 Support through the MPACT a parent mentor program that provides Technical Assistant (TA) and support to parents of students with disabilities. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, MPACT | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.4 Support, through Project ACCESS and MPACT, the provision of materials, information, training, and resource referrals for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, MPACT, Project ACESS | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.5 Support professional development for Parents as Teachers (PAT) parent educators to increase their knowledge and ability to inform and assist families of children with disabilities to link with needed resources | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, PATNC | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.6 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.7 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants, MPACT | Active Added 2/10 |
| 8.8 Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in parental involvement to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants, MPACT | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 8.9 Develop and provide a Parent and Family Involvement training module to facilitate improved involvement of parents/families of students with disabilities in their children’s education | 2011/12-2012/13 | Office of Special Education, RPDC Consultants | Active Added 2/11 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 9 –** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri's methodology for identifying districts with disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. Data for all districts are examined every year. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for each racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria for identifying a district as having disproportionate representation.

**Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"**

| Risk Ratio | Cell size |
|---|---|
| • Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation<br>OR<br>• Less than 0.25 for under representation | • At least 20 in racial/ethnic group<br>AND<br>• At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) |

If LEAs are identified, the review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

Any individual student non-compliance identified during the reviews must be corrected, even if the review does not result in a finding of noncompliance based on inappropriate identification.

The Department disseminates information to the field on evidence-based practices and strategies pertinent to this indicator through the MORE website. RPDC consultants provide training on Quality Eligibility Determinations, Response to Intervention and Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. Districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

| Year | Number of districts meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation) |
|---|---|
| 2005-06 identification using data from 2004-05 & 2005-06 | 0 in any race/ethnicity groups |
| 2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07 | 0 in any race/ethnicity groups |

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

As indicated in the table above, in 2006-07 no districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2005-06 and 2006-07, therefore no reviews were conducted resulting in no districts with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification. Thus, 0 or 0%, of districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

The identification and review processes described above result in the state being in compliance with requirements to review all racial/ethnic categories in all districts/LEAs every year for both under- and overrepresentation.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.1 Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 9.2 Provide training and professional development resources to districts identified with inappropriate identification | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 9.3 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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 | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 9.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 10 –** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Refer to the Overview of Issue in Indicator 9 for a description of the methodology used to identify and review districts with disproportionate representation. The methodology utilizes risk ratios and cell sizes when reviewing each racial/ethnic group in every district for both under- and overrepresentation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under- and over-representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

**Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"**

| Risk Ratio | Cell size |
|---|---|
| Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation<br>OR<br>Less than 0.25 for under representation | At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group<br>AND<br>At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) |

If LEAs are identified, the review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in

compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

Any individual student non-compliance identified during the reviews must be corrected, even if the review does not result in a finding of noncompliance based on inappropriate identification.

The Department disseminates information to the field on evidence-based practices and strategies pertinent to this indicator through the MORE website. RPDC consultants provide training on Quality Eligibility Determinations, Response to Intervention and Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. Districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

| Year | Number of districts meeting "over" or "under" criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation) |
|---|---|
| 2005-06 identification using data from 2004-05 & 2005-06 | • SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• ED: 2 overrepresentation of black students<br>• MR: 5 overrepresentation of black students<br>• OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups |
| 2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07 | • SLD: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• Autism: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• Sp/Lang: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups<br>• ED: 2 overrepresentation of black students<br>• MR: 5 overrepresentation of black students<br>• OHI: 0 in any race/ethnicity groups |

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR), and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

While overrepresentation of black students in the disability categories of Emotional Disturbance and Mental Retardation was seen for two years in a row, thereby identifying seven districts with disproportionate representation, there were other categories that met the criteria for only one year. These included both over- and under-representation of white or black students in Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech or Language Impairment, Other Health Impairment and Autism. Should a district meet the criteria for a second year, that district would be reviewed.

Information on district policies, procedures and practices was gathered from the seven districts identified as having disproportionate representation. No concerns were identified based upon the review of written policies and procedures related to identification of students with disabilities. Student files for recently identified students in the Mental Retardation or Emotional Disturbance disability categories were also gathered. The file review process outlined above was conducted. None of the seven districts were found to have disproportionate representation of students in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.

**0% of districts (0 / 524 = 0%)** in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

The identification and review processes described above result in the state being in compliance with requirements to review all racial/ethnic categories in all districts/LEAs every year for both under- and overrepresentation of the required disability categories.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

See Indicator 9

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 11 –** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Measurement:**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

As a part of the monitoring self-assessment process, districts submit a listing of all initial evaluations completed during the nine months prior to the submission of their self-assessment. The data include the dates of receipt of consent to evaluate and eligibility determination. If eligibility was not determined within the 60-day timeline, the district must document reasons for the extensions. Verification of the reported data and determination of acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline occurs through desk reviews and/or on-site reviews. Districts not meeting evaluation timelines are required to complete a corrective action plan and correct all noncompliance within 12 months of notification of noncompliance.

Technical assistance and/or corrective actions for this indicator include the following:

- State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Office of Special Education Compliance supervisors to target the districts who need assistance in meeting the 60-day timeline for completing initial evaluations. The Consultants work with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they develop strategies to correct the non-compliance.
- A follow-up submission of initial timelines is completed by the district and reviewed by a Compliance supervisor for compliance with 60-day timelines
- Trainings are conducted by RPDC Consultants to encourage compliance with timelines and for quality eligibility determinations completed in a timely manner. Guidance documents are posted on the web and sent as SELs messages to remind districts of the IDEA requirements associated with evaluation/eligibility determination.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

| Year | Number evaluated | Number within 60 day timeline | Number > 60 days with acceptable reason | Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason | Percent within acceptable timelines |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2005-06 | 4,107 | 3,632 | 259 | 3,891 | 94.7% |

Data from 90 districts conducting self-assessments during the 2005-06 school year.

Over 88% of all initial referrals made during 2005-06 in Missouri were completed within 60 days. An additional 6% went over 60 days but were deemed to have acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline. Approximately 75% of acceptable explanations for exceeding timelines involved school breaks, holidays, snow days, etc. Another common explanation was parent or student delays, including absences, family emergencies, etc. The reasons for exceeding timelines were reviewed by compliance supervisors and at least a quarter of the reasons deemed acceptable by districts were deemed unacceptable by the supervisors. The data provided above excludes these from the "acceptable" reasons.

Reasons determined to be unacceptable by districts and/or supervisors primarily fell under the following three areas:

- Districts waiting on outside evaluations or doctor appointments to occur, or waiting for the resulting reports to reach the district
- Districts not understanding that an eligibility staffing can occur without the parent present if the parent didn't show for the first scheduled meeting, and the second meeting notice was made through direct contact ten days prior to the second meeting, and the parent didn't show for the second scheduled meeting
- School breaks or snow days that did not fully cover the length of the delay.

If districts were found to have noncompliance due to these or other reasons, the corrective action plans will direct the actions needed to obtain full compliance with this indicator.

The vast majority of delays were less than ten days past the 60 day timeline; however an isolated number had longer delays. Some of the longer delays were due to waiting for outside evaluations, which is discussed above.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

The data above show that the state, while not at 100%, shows substantial compliance with this indicator. This verifies findings of previous monitoring reviews which have not shown evaluation timelines to be a systemic issue in Missouri.

Data will be collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above.

Public reporting of these data will include the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data will be gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle beginning with self-assessments conducted during 2005-06.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of children will be evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 11.2 Provide training and professional development to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 11.3 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 12 –** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

**Measurement:**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to 637(a)(9)(A)) for Part B eligibility determination.
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

As a part of their self-assessment, districts submit a listing of all children referred from Part C (First Steps) to Part B. This includes all children referred from Part C during the nine months prior to the submission of the self-assessment. The data include the children's birthdates and the date of IEP development. If the IEP was not developed by the child's third birthday, the district must document reasons for the timeline extensions. Verification of the reported data and determination of acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline occurs through desk reviews and/or on-site reviews. Districts not meeting Part C to Part B timelines are required to complete a corrective action plan and correct all noncompliance within 12 months of notification of noncompliance.

Technical assistance and/or corrective actions for this indicator include the following:

- Targeted technical assistance by compliance consultants to be sure that districts understand requirement for 3rd birthday
- Follow-up review to ensure correction within one year
- Targeted technical assistance with First Steps to ensure that transition meetings are held in a timely manner
- Follow-up guidance and trainings through the First Steps Area Directors and RPDC consultants
- Training and guidance documents posted on the web with regular reminders sent out through the Special Education listserv

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Part C to Part B Referrals for 2004-05**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total referred from Part C | 503 |
| Acceptable Timelines<br>• Referred & found eligible & IEP in place by third birthday<br>• Referred & found eligible by third birthday, IEP in place at start of school<br>• Late referrals from Part C, but Eligibility and IEP timely<br>• Parent delays<br>Total | 321<br>39<br>52<br>31<br>443 |
| Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday | 32 |
| Ineligible | 28 |
| Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total – Ineligible) | 93.3% |

Source: District reported data from 107 districts conducting SEMSAs in 2004-05.

Reasons for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Districts delaying evaluation until 3rd birthday. Misunderstanding by districts that IEP has to be in place by 3rd birthday, not just evaluation started
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

Noncompliance will be addressed through corrective actions as described above.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Data will be collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above. Public reporting of these data will include the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data will be gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle, so all districts will be covered at least once during the SPP six year timeline.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12.1 Provide training and professional development to all districts to improve collaboration and coordination with families and Part C agencies in the area of C to B Transition timelines. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 12.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT AND BASELINE DATA ARE NEW FOR THIS INDICATOR. THE TARGET REMAINS 100%. FIVE CURRENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011/12 THROUGH 2012/13). ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY THAT WAS INADVERTENTLY OMITTED FROM THE LAST SPP HAS BEEN ADDED.**

**Indicator 13 –** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

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

- Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?
- Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- Is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?
- Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?

- Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- Were the transition services developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests?
- Is there evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed?

Compliance supervisors review and verify district documentation based on the above standards. Districts identified with noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months.

**Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The Transition Outcomes Project was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center with support from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Empowers local school Office of Special Educations to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs, and approaches.

The Department contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to all Department staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training. During the 2008-2009 school years, 60 districts participated in TOP. Of these, 30 were in their first year of the process when they attended the TOP training, analyzed IEPs from their district, reported this information to all secondary special education staff in their district, and developed an action plan to improve transition planning and services.

The other 30 districts were in their follow-up year when they re-evaluated IEPs from their district to identify gains in Indicator 13 compliance. In 2008-09, recognition awards were given to 18 districts that showed substantial gains. In the 2009-10 school year, an additional 30 districts were added to the project and 50 districts are participating during 2010-11. This represents 15% of the districts in the state. Each year, Regional Professional Development Centers provide TOP training to participating districts in varying stages of implementation. This training includes assisting district teams in conducting IEP reviews, analyzing results, reporting Indicator 13 data to district staff, developing and implementing action plans, and conducting follow-up IEP reviews.

Indicator 13 data has shown marked improvement toward the target of 100% over the past four years (see chart below). It is believed that this increase may be largely attributed to the implementation of the TOP program and targeted professional development in the area of post-secondary transition.

| Indicator | 05-06 | 06-07 | 07-08 | 08-09 | 09-10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals | 44.8% | 73.2% | 82.5% | Not reported | 91.17% |

**Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

| Year | Number of Transition Plans Reviewed | Number that Met Standard | Percent that Met Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2009-10 | 587 | 536 | **91.3%** |

Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 111 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2009-10. A total of 97 of the 111 districts had students of transition age for whom data was collected during the year.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Data is collected in conjunction with Missouri's 5-year monitoring cycle as described above. Public reporting of these data includes the percentage determined from the district reported data. Data is gathered from each district once over the course of the five year MSIP cycle, so all districts will be covered at least once during the SPP six year timeline. Districts with identified noncompliance are required to complete corrective action plans that will ensure correction within 12 months.

There were 111 districts that completed a self-assessment in 2009-10. Of those 111 districts, there were 14 districts that were very small K-12 and K-8 districts with no transition-age students with disabilities. The data only represent those 97 districts that had transition-age students with disabilities. From those 97 districts, 587 transition plans were reviewed for compliance with Indicator 13. Of those, 536 met the standard, yielding a percent in compliance of 91.3%.

See also information for Indicator 1.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13.1 Provide professional development/training on effective practices in post secondary transition planning to state, regional and district staff | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 13.2 Manage and support a web based data system to track improved performance in effective transition planning | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 13.3 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13.4 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 13.5 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 13.6 Provide training and technical assistance on the Transition Outcomes Project (TOPs) to all districts in order to have districts at 100% compliance on Indicator 13 | 2007/08-2012/13 | TOPs contractor, Office Of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/11 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT, TARGETS AND BASELINE DATA ARE NEW FOR THIS INDICATOR. THREE CURRENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011/12 THROUGH 2012/13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED.**

**Indicator 14 –** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

**Measurement:**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri has had a post-graduate follow-up data collection system in place for all students for many years. The collection includes a break-out of students with disabilities who had graduated the previous year. Since districts are required to report on all graduates, no sampling is used for this indicator. These data are used in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) for district accreditation purposes as well as in Special Education monitoring. Through this data collection, districts report the numbers of students who attend 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools), are competitively or non-competitively employed, are in the military, or are involved in other activities.

During the 2009-10 school year, districts were also required to conduct follow-up on students with disabilities who dropped out of grades 9-12. Districts used the same reporting methodology for dropouts as for graduates.

Also in 2009-10, additional information was collected with the follow-up categories to determine whether those continuing their education had completed a full term and whether those employed had worked for at least 20 hours per week for 90 days.

**Competitive Employment:** Missouri's definition of "competitive employment" in state regulations [34 361.5(b)(11)] is...work (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part- time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled.

In the data collection for this indicator there is no distinction between full-time and part-time employment.

**Post-secondary Education:** The definition of post-secondary education for this report includes 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools) that students are attending either full or part-time.

See Indicator 1 for more information on the definitions of graduates and dropouts and information on improvement activities surrounding graduation and dropout rates, and post-secondary outcomes.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

**Graduate and Dropout Follow-up Data**

| **2009-10 Follow-up Data** | 2008-09 Graduates | | 2008-09 Dropouts | | 2008-09 Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| (1) 4 - Year College | 555 | 8.1% | 4 | 0.2% | 559 | 6.4% |
| (2) 2 - Year College | 1,465 | 21.3% | 7 | 0.4% | 1,472 | 16.9% |
| (3) Non – College | 238 | 3.5% | 24 | 1.3% | 262 | 3.0% |
| (4) Competitive Employment | 1,609 | 23.3% | 171 | 9.5% | 1,780 | 20.5% |
| (5) Noncompetitive Employment | 110 | 1.6% | 10 | 0.6% | 120 | 1.4% |
| (6) Military | 176 | 2.6% | 3 | 0.2% | 179 | 2.1% |
| (7) Continuing Education – did not complete one term | 677 | 9.8% | 33 | 1.8% | 710 | 8.2% |
| (8) Employed – less than 20 hours/week or 90 days | 466 | 6.8% | 52 | 2.9% | 518 | 6.0% |
| (9) Other | 852 | 12.4% | 347 | 19.3% | 1,199 | 13.8% |
| (10)Unknown | 743 | 10.8% | 1,144 | 63.7% | 1,887 | 21.7% |
| Total Follow-up | 6,891 | 100.0% | 1,795 | 100.0% | 8,686 | 100.0% |

Source: District-reported data via MOSIS Follow-up file

| **Categories (mutually exclusive)** | **Number** | **Percent** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school [(1) + (2)] | 2,031 | 23.4% |
| 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education) [(4) + (6)] | 1,959 | 22.6% |
| 3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) [(3)] | 262 | 3.0% |
| 4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed) [(5)] | 120 | 1.4% |
| Other categories [(7) + (8) + (9) + (10) | 4,314 | 49.7% |
| **Total Graduates and Dropouts** | 8,686 | 100.0% |

| Summary Measures (Baseline Data) | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **A:** Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2)] | 2,031 | 23.4% |
| **B:** Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (4) + (6)] | 3,990 | 45.9% |
| **C:** Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [(1) + (2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6)] | 4,372 | 50.3% |
| **Total Graduates and Dropouts** | 8,686 | |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Prior to the 2009-10 collection, follow-up data on dropouts was conducted at the state level. With the changes to the SPP Indicator, the decision was made to have districts conduct the follow-up on dropouts as well as graduates. Also new in 2009-10 was the requirement to collect additional detail on students enrolled in postsecondary education or employed in order to determine whether the students had completed a full term or the length of their employment.

Districts were notified of these data collection changes multiple times via listserv announcements and conference presentations; however, as the data were being reported it became evident that not all districts were aware of and understood the new requirements. This, in addition to the general difficulty in locating dropouts, may have contributed to the large number of “unknown” responses, as well as the large number of students who didn’t complete a full term or who worked less than 20 hours/week or 90 days.

The second year of data collection in conjunction with further communication with districts should show an increase in positive outcomes for students with disabilities in the future.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | Not applicable | | |
| **2006-2007** | Not applicable | | |
| **2007-2008** | Not applicable | | |
| **2008-2009** | Not applicable | | |
| **2009-2010** | Not applicable | | |
| **2010-2011** | A: 24.4% | B: 46.9% | C: 51.3% |
| **2011-2012** | A: 24.4% | B: 46.9% | C: 51.3% |
| **2012-2013** | A: 24.4% | B: 46.9% | C: 51.3% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to districts 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. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 14.2 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 14.3 Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |
| 14.4 Provide professional development/technical assistance to districts on data collection for this indicator. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education staff, Office of Data System Management staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/11 |
| 14.5 Support implementation of Project Search to improve employment outcomes for students with disabilities | 2011/12-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants, Project Search Staff, KU Staff | Active<br>Added 2/11 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED.**

**Indicator 15** – 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))

**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.

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri implements a comprehensive General Supervision system to ensure that noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. Missouri is currently in the fifth year (2010-11) of a five-year monitoring cycle during which all school districts and responsible public agencies in the state are reviewed. Special Education monitoring is completed in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) district review and accreditation process. For a full description of the Special Education Monitoring system see http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/documents/SpeEdMonManual.pdf. In brief, districts attend training and complete a Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment in the year prior to their scheduled MSIP review. The self-assessments are submitted to the Office of Special Education for a desk review by Office of Special Education staff. Staff uses the self-assessment compliance results combined with performance data to determine which districts will receive an on-site monitoring. In addition to procedural compliance, the self-assessment includes improvement planning to address performance areas not meeting state targets.

Two main types of determinations are made during these reviews:

1) Procedural compliance - when findings of noncompliance are made, districts are required to develop and implement corrective action plans. Districts are also required to correct any individual child noncompliance. Follow-up reviews are conducted approximately nine months from the date of the district's final report letter to confirm the district has corrected any policies and procedures found out of compliance.
2) Performance - districts are evaluated in regard to performance data, including, but not limited to, assessment, least restrictive environments, graduation and dropout rates. For each performance item indicated as "not met," the agency is instructed to develop an improvement plan to address the performance of students with disabilities.

The monitoring system is a focused system which emphasizes data-based decisions surrounding performance for students with disabilities. The two main emphases for onsite monitoring are elementary achievement and postsecondary transition. Compliance standards and indicators most closely related to student performance are reviewed, along with any other indicators selected by the State based upon the areas mentioned above. A web-based system is used by districts to submit their self-assessments, the State Agency to do both desk reviews and on-site monitoring planning and reporting and for a comprehensive collection and reporting system for all monitoring data.

**Sanctions and Corrective Actions**

The Missouri State Plan for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) outlines the sanctions and corrective actions that will be enforced for any districts that are unwilling or unable to comply with requirements. See http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/stateplan/documents/Regulation_VI_2010.pdf

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

A total of 98 districts and 9 charter schools were monitored during the 2003-04 school year, resulting in a total of 107 districts/agencies. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # Districts Reviewed 2003-04 – the number of districts/agencies reviewed on any of the topics
- # Districts with Findings – an unduplicated number of districts/agencies with one or more findings of noncompliance for each of the SPP Indicators
- # Findings in Districts 2003-04 – the total number of monitoring indicators found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance
- # Corrected within 1 Year – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year
- % Corrected within 1 year –- the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year

| Topic | # Districts Reviewed 2003-04 | # Districts with Findings | # Findings in Districts 2003-04 | # Corrected within 1 Year | % Corrected within 1 Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1, 2, 13, 14: Graduation, Dropout, Transition Planning, Post-secondary outcomes (8 monitoring indicators) | 107 | 36 | 105 | 70 | 66.7% |
| 3. Assessments (15 indicators) | 107 | 61 | 137 | 122 | 89.1% |
| 4. Suspension/ expulsion (8 indicators) | 104 | 20 | 35 | 31 | 88.6% |
| 5, 6. School-age and ECSE Placements (9 indicators) | 107 | 44 | 69 | 58 | 84.1% |
| 7. EC Outcomes | New Indicator | | | | |
| 8. Parent Involvement | New Indicator | | | | |
| 9, 10: Disproportionality | New Indicator | | | | |
| 11. 60 Day Evaluation Timelines | New Indicator | | | | |

| Topic | # Districts Reviewed 2003-04 | # Districts with Findings | # Findings in Districts 2003-04 | # Corrected within 1 Year | % Corrected within 1 Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. C to B Transition (3 indicators) | 43 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 88.9% |
| Referral (3 monitoring indicators) | 107 | 71 | 107 | 67 | 62.6% |
| IEP-Present level of performance (1 indicator) | 107 | 54 | 54 | 28 | 51.9% |
| IEP-Measurable Goals (1 indicator) | 107 | 63 | 63 | 32 | 50.8% |
| IEP-Special Education Services Identified (1 indicator) | 107 | 40 | 40 | 33 | 82.5% |
| Services provided in accordance with IEP (1 indicator) | 107 | 20 | 20 | 12 | 60.0% |
| Written notice for change in services (1 indicator) | 103 | 34 | 34 | 21 | 61.8% |
| Eligibility-Learning Disability (1 indicator) | 84 | 19 | 19 | 8 | 42.1% |
| Child Complaint Allegations | | | 118 | 118 | 100% |
| Total | | | 819 | 616 | 75.2% |

The data above pertaining to corrective actions resulting from complaint investigations provides OSEP with a progress report on Missouri's steps to ensure that noncompliance identified in those decisions is corrected in a timely manner. The Department modified internal procedures to monitor the submission of corrective actions for child complaints in 2004-05. The data above verifies the implementation and effectiveness of the modified procedures. As directed on page 13 of the November 14, 2005 APR letter, DESE is considering this the final report on this matter.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

**Noncompliance related to SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:**

The 2003-04 findings for the monitoring priorities and indicators show that for most areas, over 80% of the findings were corrected within one year. Follow-up reviews have been conducted for all of the districts and charter schools with outstanding noncompliance after one year. An analysis of current data shows that 17 of the 107 districts/agencies reviewed during the 2003-04 school year continue to have outstanding noncompliance related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators. As of the date of this report, a specific analysis of the data shows the following number of districts and findings remain outstanding on each indicator:

| SPP Indicators | Districts | Findings |
|---|---|---|
| 1, 2, 13, 14 | 8 | 22 |
| 3 | 10 | 14 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 5, 6 | 4 | 7 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total* | 17 | 47 |

* Total districts is an unduplicated number of districts with outstanding noncompliance

The following actions have been taken with the districts/charters demonstrating continued noncompliance related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

- All districts have been assigned to a special education regional compliance consultant and will have received a contact by January 15, 2006, to assist in the correction of noncompliance.
- Follow-up reviews are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2006.
- All districts have been advised that should they be unwilling or unable to correct outstanding areas of noncompliance by the date indicated, the Department may initiate proceedings to invoke sanctions, including the withholding of state and/or federal funds

**Noncompliance not related to SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:**

Baseline data for areas not related to the monitoring priorities and indicators show that only about 60 percent of the findings were cleared within one year of identification. Follow-up reviews have been conducted for all of the districts and charter schools with outstanding noncompliance after one year. An analysis of current data shows that 34 of the 107 districts/charter schools reviewed during the 2003-04 school year continue to have outstanding non-compliance in the specified areas with a total of 95 outstanding findings. As of the date of this report, a specific analysis of the data shows the following number of districts and findings remain outstanding on each indicator:

| Topic | Districts | Findings |
|---|---|---|
| Referral | 25 | 38 |
| IEP—PLEP | 16 | 16 |
| IEP—Measurable Goals | 23 | 23 |
| IEP—Services identified | 7 | 7 |
| IEP—Services provided | 6 | 6 |
| Written Notice—Services | 8 | 8 |
| Eligibility—LD | 11 | 11 |
| Total | 34 | 109 |

* Total districts is an unduplicated number of districts with outstanding noncompliance

The following actions have been taken with the districts/charters demonstrating continued noncompliance in areas not related to the SPP monitoring priorities and indicators:

- All districts have been assigned to a special education regional compliance consultant and will have received a contact by January 15, 2006, to assist in the correction of noncompliance.
- Follow-up reviews are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2006.
- All districts have been advised that should they be unwilling or unable to correct outstanding areas of noncompliance by the date indicated, the Department may initiate proceedings to invoke sanctions, including the withholding of state and/or federal funds

**Youth with disabilities in city and county jails:**

In the Department's June 27, 2005, final report to OSEP it was indicated that out of 20 districts originally out of compliance on the above issue, four districts remained non-compliant and that those districts had submitted to the Department Corrective Action Plans assuring that they would have procedures in place within 12 months to ensure that they identify, and offer the provision of services to, students with disabilities under their jurisdiction incarcerated in local city/county jails. The Department has subsequently monitored those four districts for compliance with this provision. Three of the districts have provided sufficient documentation that they do have adequate procedures in place to identify and offer the provision of services to students with disabilities under their jurisdiction incarcerated in local city/county jails. The one remaining district continues to be non-compliant in this area. In the interim, this district has been declared unaccredited by the State of Missouri and the operation of the district taken over by the State. Representatives of all Office of Special Educations of the Department, including Special Education, have been assigned to this district to ensure that all State and federal standards and regulations are being met. The special education compliance consultant in the St. Louis RPDC is working

with this district to identify and develop a plan for correction of any noncompliance, including identification and provision of services to incarcerated youth.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15.1 Implement a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 15.2 Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 15.3 Manage General Supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance | 2006/07-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 15.4 Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 16** – 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

**Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

A child complaint may be filed by any individual or organization that believes there has been a violation of any state or federal regulation implementing the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined that the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by a staff member of the Office of Special Education. Decisions are issued by the Commissioner of Education within sixty (60) days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined that a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made.

In resolving a complaint in which it is found that a responsible public agency is out of compliance, the Department addresses within its decision how to remediate the compliance violation, including as appropriate, the awarding of monetary reimbursement or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the child; and appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities. If needed, technical assistance activities and negotiations are undertaken.

If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the part(s) of the complaint that are being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing.

If an issue is raised in a complaint that has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, the hearing decision is binding. A complaint alleging a school district's failure to implement a due process decision is resolved by the Department through the child complaint process.

Data are collected via a child complaint/due process database which alerts compliance staff to upcoming deadlines for resolution of child complaints as well as corrective actions ordered and the dates they need to be completed.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Child Complaints**

| School Year | Total Filed | Total Decisions | Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions | Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2002-2003 | 166 | 150 | 3 | 0 |
| 2003-2004 | 154 | 145 | 23 | 0 |
| 2004-2005 | 107 | 90 | 5 | 0 |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

All complaints have had reports issued within 60-day timeline or within appropriately extended timelines.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines. |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16.1 Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints. | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 16.2 Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders. | 2008/09-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE. SPP TARGETS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13). PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, TWO IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN ADDED THAT ARE SPECIFIC TO THIS INDICATOR AND EXTEND TO 2012-13.**

**Indicator 17** – Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

**Measurement:**
Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Due Process Hearing System in the State of Missouri is a one-tier system consisting of a state-level, three-member Hearing Panel and a single Hearing Officer for Expedited Hearings in Part B. The Expedited Hearing Officers are attorneys under contract with the State of Missouri. The hearing panel is composed of two trained lay officers, one selected by each party, and a Hearing Chair who is an attorney on contract with the State of Missouri. Mediation at State expense is available to the parties both prior and subsequent to the filing of a request for a Due Process Hearing.

Missouri has made changes to State statutes to incorporate changes in the procedures for Due Process and Mediation made as a result of reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. The Procedural Safeguards Statement for Children and Parents has been revised to incorporate the provisions of the federal statute. State regulatory changes were made following the issuance of final federal regulations.

All Hearing Chairs have been advised of the requirements of the federal statute and changes have been made in the state data collection system to ensure collection of all relevant data regarding the Due Process and Mediation system. Districts and parents have been advised of the requirements through dissemination of the Procedural Safeguards Statement for Children and Parents, SELS listserv messages, and IDEA 2004 trainings held throughout the state.

Data are collected via a child complaint/due process database which alerts staff to upcoming deadlines.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Due Process Hearing Requests**

| School Year | Total Due Process Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension |
|---|---|
| 2002-2003 | 0 |
| 2003-2004 | 0 |
| 2004-2005 | 0 |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

All Due Process Hearings have been fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| All Years | 100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines. |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17.1 Provide online training of due process requirements, including timelines, to all hearing officers. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | New 4/11 |
| 17.2 Manage due process system to ensure hearing chairs are in full compliance with contract provisions including timelines. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | New 4/11 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 18 –** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Measurement:**

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

During 2009-10 procedures were developed and implemented to track and follow-up on resolution session timelines and outcomes. SEA staff is assigned when a request for a Due Process Hearing is filed. Staff communicates with the LEA to remind them of the requirement to conduct a Resolution Session and of the timelines. Follow-up communication is conducted until the session is held and an outcome determined or until one or both parties agrees not to conduct the Resolution Session and to proceed with the Due Process Hearing.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

| | |
|---|---|
| Resolution Sessions | 32 |
| Settlement Agreements | 15 |
| Percent Settlement Agreements | 46.9% |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Data indicates that slightly less than half of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. As this was the first year for this new process, future trend data will allow evaluation of the usage and successes of resolution sessions.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | Not Applicable |
| **2006-2007** | 50.0% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements |
| **2007-2008** | 35.0% |
| **2008-2009** | 35.1% |
| **2009-2010** | 35.2% |
| **2010-2011** | 35.3% |
| **2011-2012** | 35.3% |
| **2012-2013** | 35.3% |

**Note about targets:** OSEP approved revisions to targets for 2007-08 and subsequent years based on the justification below. The revised targets were lower than the baseline data for the state.

*The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In addition, indicator 18 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if resolution is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in resolution hearings. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.* See Annual Performance Report, 2006-07, Submitted April 14, 2008.

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18.1 Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 19 –** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Office of Special Education maintains a database for tracking mediation requests. Staff tracks the date the request for mediation is received, the date held, whether it was prior to or following the filing of a child complaint or due process, and whether it was successful or not. Staff also contacts the assigned mediator and/or the district involved if no report is received concerning the outcome of the request.

**Actual Target Data for 2006-2007:**

Missouri did not meet the target for percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements. While we did not meet the target, it is significant that an increased number of mediations took place during this year.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

| | Mediation Agreements | Total Mediations | Percent with Agreements |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2002-03 | 5 | 8 | 62.5% |
| 2003-04 | 6 | 11 | 54.5% |
| 2004-05* | 8 | 13 | 61.5% |

* 5 pending as of 11/7/05

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Data show that the percent of mediations that result in a mediation agreement has been between 54% and 63% over the past three years.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 62.0% of mediations will result in mediation agreements |
| **2006-2007** | 62.5% |
| **2007-2008** | 35.0% |
| **2008-2009** | 35.1% |
| **2009-2010** | 35.2% |
| **2010-2011** | 35.3% |
| **2011-2012** | 35.3% |
| **2012-2013** | 35.3% |

**Note about targets:** OSEP approved revisions to targets for 2007-08 and subsequent years based on the justification below. The revised targets were lower than the baseline data for the state.

*The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In addition, indicator 19 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if mediation is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be investigated as a child complaint or heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in mediation. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.*
See Annual Performance Report, 2006-07, Submitted April 14, 2008.

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19.1 Provide information on the Missouri complaint system through the Parent's Guide to Special Education. | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Added 2/10 |

# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**PER OSEP INSTRUCTIONS, THE TEXT OF THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE, AND SPP TARGETS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS (2011-12 AND 2012-13).**

**Indicator 20 –** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

**Measurement:**

State reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Report data, are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
b. Accurate, including covering the correct year

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Missouri has reported all 618 data and annual performance reports by the due dates.

The primary methods of facilitating accurate reporting by districts are as follows:

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the new MOSIS collection system which populates the web-based Core Data Collection System. Manuals with reporting instructions and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and Core Data systems. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Department staff. The end-of-year collections for 2007-08 were the first special education collections to be collected solely through MOSIS. Office of Data System Management Special Education staff work extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level
- Data editing and validation are handled by Department staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting
- Staff working with Special Education data serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various Department programs are met
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data

During 2009-10, the Department finalized and implemented a rubric for evaluating the timeliness and accuracy of district data submissions. Deadlines by which data must be certified through MOSIS were established and tracked. A system was put in place to regularly contact districts who had not yet certified their data in order to help them meet the deadline. Staff works closely with districts to resolve accuracy issues.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

All 618 data and annual performance reports have been submitted on or before due dates.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri strives to report data in a timely and accurate manner. Accuracy is assured through a variety of verification procedures as described above.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of state reported data are timely and accurate |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20.1 Support the development and implementation of Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS) | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 20.2 Provide information to State Supervisors of Instruction and school administrators regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/10 |
| 20.3 Develop and Manage web-based data system (FormHog) for management of contracts and data collection for statewide initiatives (SW-PBS, MIM, RtI and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)) | 2010/11-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active<br>Added 2/10 |