Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™

# STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

## MISSOURI PART C
## 2006-2007 through 2012-2013

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

# Table of Contents

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

**Indicator 1:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. ..... 3

**Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. ..... 6

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: ..... 8
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

**Indicator 4:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: ..... 13
A. Know their rights;
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
C. Help their children develop and learn.

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. ..... 17

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. ..... 19

**Indicator 7:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. ..... 21

**Indicator 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: ..... 23
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

**Indicator 9:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification... 26

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. 31

**Indicator 11:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. ..... 33

**Indicator 12:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). ..... 35

**Indicator 13:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. ..... 36

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. ..... 37

**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 SPPS IS ARCHIVED AND CAN BE LOCATED AT HTTP://DESE.MO.GOV/DIVSPECED/SPPPAGE.HTML.**

The original draft of the Missouri State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed by the Office of Special Education, based in part on previous Annual Performance Reports to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), which were developed in conjunction with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The original draft was presented to System Point of Entry (SPOE) directors in Jefferson City on September 8, 2005, and to the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) on September 9, 2005. Based on feedback from these stakeholders, revisions were made and a revised draft of the SPP was posted on the Office of Special Education's website on October 15, 2005. SPOE/SICC members agreed to disseminate the SPP to larger audiences through Regional and Local Interagency Coordination Council (RICC/LICC) meetings, with comments returned to the Office of Special Education by November 1. A revised draft was presented to the SICC November 18, 2005, and the final plan was submitted to OSEP December 2, 2005. Annually thereafter, any revisions to the SPP have been presented to and approved by the SICC.

**Public Dissemination and Reporting of Data:**

The Department reports annually to the public the performance of the state and each SPOE compared to the targets established in this SPP. The State Performance Plan, the Annual Performance Report, and the public reporting of each SPOE are posted on the Department's website under the SPP/APR page at: http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/spppage.html.

**Overview of Missouri's Part C System:**

Missouri's Part C system is comprised of regional System Point of Entry (SPOE) offices, a Central Finance Office (CFO) and early intervention providers. The state contracts for SPOEs in ten regional offices. The SPOEs are responsible for local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and initial IFSP development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

Under the SPOE contract, SPOE administrators have the following responsibilities:

- Conduct personnel evaluations for all employed Service Coordinators
- Assure implementation of any corrective action resulting from a complaint decision or monitoring review
- Organize, develop and appoint a Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) to assist with public awareness, child find, and establishing a target child count
- Develop, implement, and maintain a system of providers for Early Intervention Teams
- Develop, implement, maintain, and evaluate child find activities
- Maintain a professional development plan for service provider training and oversight.

The state also contracts for a CFO to perform responsibilities including provider enrollment, fiscal management, child data system, and provider payments.

All early intervention services are provided by personnel meeting state qualifications who enroll with the CFO and are selected from a matrix which provides basic information regarding availability, coverage area, and trainings completed, among other items. Missouri is moving toward a transdisciplinary approach where teams consisting of occupational therapists, physical therapists, speech-language pathologists and special instructors serve as primary or supporting providers to eligible children and their families. The teams of providers are organized and maintained by the SPOEs.

**General Supervision System:**

The Department, as the lead agency, is responsible for ensuring a general supervision system, which includes standards and procedures regarding monitoring, public awareness, professional development, complaints processing, data collection, financial management, and interagency agreements. Monitoring

activities include data collection, analysis and reporting, and cyclical compliance reviews. The Department documents any findings of noncompliance and verifies timely correction of all noncompliance through written correspondence to agencies via the Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS).

**First Steps Area Directors:**

The Department employs five First Steps Area Directors who provide direction, training and problem solving for SPOE agencies. The Area Directors maintain regular interaction with the SPOE offices in order to strengthen communication between the state and local offices, which enables the lead agency to provide a consistent message to the early intervention community.

Additionally, the Area Directors work with service providers and RICCs to problem-solve and provide technical assistance around all aspects of early intervention services. The Area Directors are an integral part of the movement toward Early Intervention Teams, Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. The Area Directors also provide regional training to referral sources, Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other community agencies to assist in the implementation of Part C and to emphasize recommended practices for infants and toddlers.

**Development of IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS):**

Missouri has developed, in collaboration with stakeholders, the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) staff, and national experts, an *IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS)*. The QIRS is designed to be used by the Part C program for accountability purposes. The QIRS addresses each area of the IFSP document in a Likert scale fashion, with "1" representing Unacceptable, "3" representing Acceptable, and "5" representing Best Practice. Each Likert scale item has a descriptor for determining into which category the IFSP fell for each area evaluated. The quality review identifies areas of strengths and concerns in IFSPs reviewed and aggregates data for the overall quality of IFSPs in each region. The Missouri Part C program incorporates the use of the *Missouri First Steps IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale* into the SPOE contract performance review.

**Web-based Child Data System:**

Missouri's web-based child data and IFSP system was implemented September 1, 2005, and an enhancement is scheduled to be released in 2011. The system contains all elements of referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. The system is compliance-driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. Data regarding demographics, health information, outcomes, domains, and IFSP specifics are available online for children in the web system, which has become an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system.

**Evaluation 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 2010-2011. 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: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

Services for Infants and Toddlers and their families in Missouri's Part C (First Steps) program are provided as follows:

System Points of Entry:
Service coordination is provided by System Points of Entry (SPOEs) through contracts with the Lead Agency. Service Coordinators develop the initial and subsequent Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) and complete data entry in the web-based child record system (i.e., WebSPOE), which enables "real-time" entry of parental consent and IFSP service authorizations.

Contracted Providers:
Providers of service are independent contractors with the State of Missouri and must meet state qualifications and enroll with the Central Finance Office (CFO) in order to be authorized for IFSP services.

Central Finance Office Billing System (WebSPOE):
Delivered services are collected through the CFO billing system where providers submit an electronic claim for payment. In order to determine that a child received services in a timely manner, all services must have started within 30 days of parental consent. If a child has a "No Provider Available" (NPA) authorization, the child cannot be counted for timely services since this indicates that the service did not begin because no provider was available to provide the service.

When the first billed service date comes 30 days after the meeting date, or when 60 days have passed without billing of any kind, the child's name appears on a "Timely Services" list in WebSPOE where Service Coordinators can review the provision of services in accordance with the IFSP. Once the child's name and service appears on the list, the Service Coordinator must address the reason for untimely service as: Parent/child delay; Service Coordinator delay; IFSP team decision for delay, Provider delay, or Authorization/Billing issue. If the reason was coded as unacceptable (i.e., Service Coordinator or Provider delay) then the Service Coordinator must address compensatory services with the family.

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

Children Receiving Timely IFSP Services 2004-05

| | |
|---|---|
| Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days | 4,743 |
| Total Children Receiving IFSP Services | 6,805 |
| % of Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days | 69.7% |

Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days is determined by subtracting the authorization start date for a given service from the first date of service. If one or more service on the child's IFSP is greater than 30 days or the child received a 'No Provider Available' authorization within the span of dates (7/1/2004 to 6/30/2005), the child is not counted as receiving all IFSP Services within 30 days.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Prior to requirements and development of this State Performance Plan, the timely provision of services was not measured in this fashion, and it is important to note that during 2004-05 it was not known that these data would be used to derive the timelines. There are likely some inconsistencies between SPOEs and service coordinators in the way that IFSP service start dates are entered into the system; some may be entered based on provider availability, some on IFSP meeting dates, some on the date service is expected to start, etc. There is also inconsistency in the use and entry of No Provider Available authorizations. In order to make these data more consistent, technical assistance will be provided to service coordinators and SPOEs.

The determination of timely services was made by looking at all services authorized for a child. If any single service began more than 30 days past the authorized start date, the child was not counted as receiving timely services. This results in 2,062 or 30.3% of children counted as not receiving at least one service within 30 days. However, approximately 98% of children receive at least one service within the 30 day timeline which indicates that the vast majority of children receive some services within 30 days.

In order to account for the 30.3% of children receiving IFSP services who did not receive all services in a timely manner, the Office of Special Education examined the data. Of the 2,062 children who did not receive all services in a timely manner, 894 received all services within 45 days of authorization (meaning 80.7% of children received all IFSP services within 45 days); another 409 had received all services within 60 days (86.7%). Also, 156 of the 2,062 children received at least one 'No Provider Available' authorization meaning that a provider was not available to provide the service for some length of time. The length of time for which no providers were available could not be easily ascertained from the data; therefore some children may have been without a provider for a short amount of time, possibly even less than the 30 day window.

SPOE Regions with the lowest percent of children receiving all IFSP services within 30 days included Camdenton/Rolla (44.9%), Union (53.2%), Springfield (53.4%), Montgomery City (56.7%), and Cuba (59.4%). SPOEs with the highest percent included Hannibal (76.9%), Jefferson City (75.6%), and St. Louis County (75.2%).

Looking at specific service types in which delays were experienced, 30.6% of the 304 Audiology authorizations from 7/1/2004 to 6/30/2005 were delivered after 30 days, along with 24.6% of 858 Nutrition Services authorizations, 19.7% of 370 Nursing Services authorizations, 14.4% of 5,797 Physical Therapy authorizations, 13.3% of 5,892 Special Instruction authorizations, and 12.3% of 7,239 Occupational Therapy authorizations. The services least prone to delay included Special Instruction-ABA (5.5% of 1,139 authorizations delivered after at least 30 days), Speech Language Pathology (9.5% of 10,058 authorizations), and Bilingual Interpretation (9.5% of 231 authorizations).

Public reporting of these data will entail reporting by SPOE region on the percent of children receiving all services within 30 days.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators and providers on initiating timely IFSP services through a Transdisciplinary Team approach. | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 1.2 Provide materials for Service Coordinators and providers to clarify policies/procedures related to initiation of services after initial IFSP decisions | 2007/08 – 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**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 IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN MOVED TO THIS INDICATOR FROM INDICATOR 9 AND OTHER IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

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

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

Data on service locations are collected through the child data system in two ways. Following completion of the IFSP, a primary setting for the IFSP is selected by the IFSP team during initial and annual reviews. Second, in order to authorize a service, each service must indicate the location as Home, Other Family Location, Community Setting or Special Purpose Center/Clinic. The web system requires a justification for any service authorized in a non-natural environment. Justification for services provided outside of the natural environment is monitored in conjunction with SPOE visits, and is not an area where problems have been found, except for some isolated situations. The IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale includes a section evaluating justification of services outside the natural environment.

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

| Primary Setting for children under 3 years of age with active IFSPs | 12/1/2002 | % | 12/1/2003 | % | 12/1/2004 | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Home | 2276 | 77.4% | 3042 | 88.9% | 3126 | 90.7% |
| Program Designed for Typically Developing Children | 228 | 7.7% | 229 | 6.7% | 212 | 6.2% |
| Total | | 85.1% | | 95.6% | | 96.9% |
| Program Designed for Children with Developmental Delay or Disabilities | 182 | 6.2% | 124 | 3.6% | 78 | 2.3% |
| Service Provider Location | 1 | 0.0% | 10 | 0.3% | 11 | 0.3% |
| Hospital (Inpatient) | 1 | 0.0% | 6 | 0.2% | 16 | 0.5% |
| Other Setting | 254 | 8.6% | 12 | 0.4% | 2 | 0.1% |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri has a very high percentage of children served in natural environments according to the primary setting data. Similarly, service location data from October 2005 show that 74.6% of services are provided in the home, 15.9% in community settings and 2.0% in other family locations, totaling 92.5% of services provided in natural environments. Both the primary setting data and the service location data show high levels of services provided in natural Environments in the State. However, there are areas of the state

that have a disproportionate number of services provided in special purpose centers (e.g, hospital, service provider location, etc.). These areas are reviewed during the quarterly data review process and consultants have been directed to visit certain special purpose centers and to speak with service coordinators to gather more information regarding this issue.

Data on the locations of services are publicly reported by SPOE region in the Key Indicators report which is posted on the web monthly. Primary setting data will be added to the public reporting of data.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 95.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children |
| **2006-2007** | 95.0% |
| **2007-2008** | 95.0% |
| **2008-2009** | 95.0% |
| **2009-2010** | 95.0% |
| **2010-2011** | 95.0% |
| **2011-2012** | 95.0% |
| **2012-2013** | 95.0% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

See also Indicator 1

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs identified through evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve/maintain performance on this indicator | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff & Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 2.2 Implement IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS) to assess IFSP quality | 2006/07 – 2012/13 | LA Staff & Area Directors | Active<br>Moved from Indicator 9<br>2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**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). TARGETS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO SHOW IMPROVEMENT OVER THE BASELINE.**

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

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

**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 (ECO), Missouri convened representatives from both the First Steps and 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 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 First Steps 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. While First Steps personnel are not required to use a specific instrument or to choose from an approved list of instruments when evaluating early childhood outcomes, the state does provide an Early Childhood Outcomes Tool designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C APR. This tool is currently used by all local programs and can be viewed at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html.
- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) was 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 the Department
- 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 six 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 the Department 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 First Steps personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1-5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question: "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

**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 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # children | % children | # children | % children | # children | % children |
| a. Did not improve functioning | 23 | 2.5% | 22 | 2.4% | 19 | 2.0% |
| b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 120 | 12.8% | 135 | 14.4% | 138 | 14.8% |
| c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers | 237 | 25.3% | 244 | 26.1% | 345 | 36.9% |
| d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 215 | 23.0% | 221 | 23.6% | 284 | 30.4% |
| e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 340 | 36.4% | 313 | 33.5% | 149 | 15.9% |
| Total | 935 | 100.0% | 935 | 100.0% | 935 | 100.0% |

**Summary Statements (2008-09 baseline)**

| | A: Positive social-emotional skills | B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills | C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited | 76.0% | 74.8% | 80.0% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited. | 59.4% | 57.1% | 46.3% |

**Summary Statements (2009-10 revised baseline per 2009-10 APR)**

| | A: Positive social-emotional skills | B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills | C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited | 69.1% | 70.3% | 73.0% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited. | 47.4% | 45.5% | 36.1% |

Based on the comparison of entry to exit ratings for children who entered First Steps either during the pilot of 2005-06 or after October 2006 for all other SPOEs 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 the 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 for the participants 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 | 68.4%<br>67.3%<br>72.0% | 53.5%<br>51.4%<br>41.7% |
| **2010-2011** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 69.2%<br>70.4%<br>73.1% | 47.5%<br>45.6%<br>36.2% |
| **2011-2012** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 69.2%<br>70.4%<br>73.1% | 47.5%<br>45.6%<br>36.2% |
| **2012-2013** | A: Social Emotional<br>B: Knowledge and Skills<br>C: Behaviors | 69.2%<br>70.4%<br>73.1% | 47.5%<br>45.6%<br>36.2% |

The original 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 State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE). At that time, the Department/stakeholder group, as well as the SICC 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 did not reflect a true picture of Missouri. Therefore, it was recommended by the stakeholder groups that we identify targets believed to be more reflective of Missouri's performance, even though they were lower than the baseline data for 2008-2009.

As seen in the tables above, data for 2009-10 were significantly different from the 2008-09 data, which supports the hypothesis above. Due to the technical assistance provided to SPOEs, we believe the 2009-10 data are more representative of the state and therefore we are setting a new baseline for this indicator.

Per OSEP instructions in the Missouri Response Table, targets for 2010-2011 have been revised to show improvement over the revised 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 State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE).

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 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 |
| 3.2 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 |
| 3.3 Provide targeted technical assistance to agencies identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 3.4 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 C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

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

Missouri conducts an annual survey of all families with children in the First Steps program. The first Family Survey was conducted in 2004. Minor changes have been made to the survey over the years based on response rates and suggestions from the SICC.

A copy of the First Steps Annual Family Survey can be found at http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/FirstSteps/pdfs/Forms/2006CFOSurvey.pdf.

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

**Family Survey Data**

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

| *Q7. I received information and explanations about our family's legal rights (such as due process, procedural safeguards, child complaints).* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Family Survey 2004 | | | Family Survey 2005 | | | Family Survey 2006 | | |
| Strongly Agree | 609 | 47.5% | 93.1% | 526 | 56.4% | 92.8% | 422 | 53.1% | 93.5% |
| Agree | 586 | 45.7% | | 340 | 36.4% | | 321 | 40.4% | |
| Disagree | 70 | 5.5% | 6.9% | 55 | 5.9% | 7.2% | 39 | 4.9% | 6.5% |
| Strongly Disagree | 18 | 1.4% | | 12 | 1.3% | | 13 | 1.6% | |

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

| *Q21. Since being part of First Steps, I know how to work with professionals and advocate for what my child needs.* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Family Survey 2004 | | | Family Survey 2005 | | | Family Survey 2006 | | |
| Strongly Agree | 529 | 40.6% | 93.3% | 569 | 60.2% | 96.0% | 395 | 49.3% | 95.6% |
| Agree | 687 | 52.7% | | 338 | 35.8% | | 371 | 46.3% | |
| Disagree | 75 | 5.8% | 6.7% | 34 | 3.6% | 4.0% | 25 | 3.1% | 4.3% |
| Strongly Disagree | 13 | 1.0% | | 4 | 0.4% | | 10 | 1.2% | |

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

| *Q14. Early intervention services give my family ways to improve my child's development.* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Family Survey 2004 | | | Family Survey 2005 | | | Family Survey 2006 | | |
| Strongly Agree | 886 | 64.6% | 98.8% | 771 | 77.8% | 98.4% | 615 | 72.4% | 98.5% |
| Agree | 469 | 34.2% | | 204 | 20.6% | | 222 | 26.1% | |
| Disagree | 15 | 1.1% | 1.2% | 13 | 1.3% | 1.6% | 7 | 0.8% | 1.5% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 0.1% | | 3 | 0.3% | | 6 | 0.7% | |

| *Q18. Early intervention services have increased my family's capacity to enhance my child's development.* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Family Survey 2004 | | | Family Survey 2005 | | | Family Survey 2006 | | |
| Strongly Agree | 886 | 64.6% | 98.8% | 743 | 75.6% | 98.7% | 584 | 69.4% | 97.8% |
| Agree | 469 | 34.2% | | 227 | 23.1% | | 239 | 28.4% | |
| Disagree | 15 | 1.1% | 1.2% | 11 | 1.1% | 1.3% | 14 | 1.7% | 2.2% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 0.1% | | 2 | 0.2% | | 4 | 0.5% | |

**Average affirmative response for question related to Indicator 4C: 98.2%** (added 2/2008 per OSEP's instructions to clarify the data set to be used for baseline. The baseline for Indicator 4C is the average of the agreement for the two questions: Average of 98.5% and 97.8% = 98.2%.)

Survey response rates:
2004 – 42.1% (1,400 of 3,328)
2005 – 30.7% (1,023 of 3,327)
2006 – 28.2% (867 of 3,076)

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Baseline data show very high levels of agreement with the statements that early intervention services have helped families know their rights, effectively communicate their children's needs and help their children develop and learn.

To ensure that the Family Survey data provided a representative sample of the state, demographic information was analyzed. When child count data and survey responses by SPOE were examined, it was evident that all SPOEs had a representative number of responses in the 2006 survey. Four of the SPOE regions had a higher percentage of surveys submitted than their percentage of the state's child count, and six of SPOE regions had a lower percentage of surveys submitted than their percentage of the state's child count. None of the differences between surveys and child count were significant, therefore leading to the conclusion that all SPOEs were adequately represented.

Data by race indicates that 89.2% of the respondents were white and 6.4% were black with other races making up 4.3% of the total. In comparison, as of December 1, 2005, 79.8% of children with active IFSPs in the First Steps program were white, 14.9% were black, and 5.3% were Hispanic/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander or American Indian/Alaska Native.

Because of the disproportionately high number of white respondents and disproportionately low number of black respondents, the responses of the two races were examined. For each of the four survey questions used for this indictor, the rates of agreement for black and white respondents were very similar. For Question 7 ("know their rights"), white respondents agreed or strongly agreed 93.1% of the time, compared to 92.0% of the black respondents. For Question 21 ("advocate needs"), the agreement rates were 95.4% for white respondents and 97.9% for black respondents. For Question 14 ("ways to improve child's development"), white respondents were at 98.3%, while black respondents were at 100.0%; and for Question 18 ("increased family's capacity"), white respondents were at 97.7%, while black respondents were once again at 100.0%. While the agreement rates were very similar between black and white respondents, three of the four questions had slightly higher rates of agreement for black respondents than white. Given the similarity of responses, the disproportionate number of responses is not deemed to have had a negative effect on the representation of the survey results.

Length of time in the First Steps system is another demographic variable gathered on the survey. The Office of Special Education examined the number of survey responses compared to the number of First Steps participants by length of time in program. Lengths of time in program examined included 0-6 months, 6-12 months, 1-2 years and more than 2 years. There were no significant differences between the survey return rate and the actual program participants by length of time in program.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 95% of parents will agree or strongly agree with the survey items |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1 Support Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families | 2007/08- 2012/13 | LA Staff, MPACT | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 4.2 Plan for the development of a First Steps family mentor program | 2007/08- 2012/13 | LA Staff, MPACT | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.3 Provide training and technical assistance to service coordinators based on results of First Steps Family Survey | 2007/08- 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

While child find is a state-level responsibility, most of Missouri's child find efforts occur at the regional level. Since February 2006, SPOE contracts have required the SPOEs to organize a Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC). Roles of the RICC include assisting the SPOE with public awareness, child find, and establishing a target child count. Activities include maintenance of SPOE and Hospital/NICU relationships and targeted child find activities at the SPOE/RICC levels with assistance from the First Steps Area Directors. The SPOE contract places responsibility on the SPOE agencies and their RICCs to work with primary referral sources to identify and reach under-served populations. To review their efforts, a contract performance measure looks at the percentage of children served each year in each region.

At the state level, the Department posts monthly data reports outlining the number and type of referrals, eligibility reasons and active child count for each SPOE region. Data show that the majority of SPOE regions have steadily increased the number of children served in the First Steps program since 2004 with the exception of a slight decrease in 2006-07. Referral source data suggest that the public is aware of the First Steps program and eligibility and participation data are relatively consistent across race categories and SPOE regions.

Also at the state level, the Department has an inter-agency agreement with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) that includes DMH Regional Centers assistance with child find activities. Discussions with Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) about the newborn hearing screening program have led to the development of an informal process for collecting the information and training for the SPOEs. Discussions are ongoing with the Department of Social Services (DSS) Children's Division regarding a memorandum of understanding regarding Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) referrals.

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

**Percent of Children Birth to Age 1 with IFSPs**

| | Dec-02 | Dec-03 | Dec-04 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Missouri | 0.48% | 0.61% | 0.67% |

**States with Narrow Eligibility Criteria (Excluding At Risk)**
**Comparison of December 2004 Birth to 1 Child Count / 2004 Population Estimates**

| | |
|---|---|
| North Dakota | 1.72% |
| Montana | 1.58% |
| Oklahoma | 1.22% |
| Alaska | 0.82% |
| **MISSOURI** | **0.67%** |
| Arizona | 0.61% |
| Nevada | 0.58% |
| District of Columbia | 0.57% |
| National Baseline | 0.92% |

Source: Data from http://www.federalresourcecenter.org/frc/sppc.htm

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri continues to serve less than the average percentage of children both for the states with narrow eligibility criteria and nationally; however, Missouri's child count data for children birth to age 1 has been increasing over the past several years. Current data suggest that there will be an increase in the number of children birth to age 1 for the December 2005 child count.

Analysis of referral source data and eligibility rates show consistent data across the state. Referral source data show large increases in referrals from NICUs and parents for infants under 1 year. Those are the two most appropriate referral sources for the youngest infants, indicating that child find efforts in the state are resulting in an appropriate percentage of infants and toddlers served by the Part C system.

Data on percentage of children served by SPOE is publicly reported in the SPOE Report which is posted on the web monthly.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 0.70% of infants and toddlers birth to 1 will have IFSPs |
| **2006-2007** | 0.73% |
| **2007-2008** | 0.76% |
| **2008-2009** | 0.79% |
| **2009-2010** | 0.82% |
| **2010-2011** | 0.85% |
| **2011-2012** | 0.85% |
| **2012-2013** | 0.85% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1 Provide information and/or resources to primary referral sources in order to improve child find procedures, reduce inappropriate referrals, and target underserved populations | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors, RICCs, SPOE | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS (SEE INDICATOR 5).**

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

See Indicator 5

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

**Percent of Children Birth to Age 3 with IFSPs**

| | Dec-02 | Dec-03 | Dec-04 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Missouri | 1.33% | 1.51% | 1.53% |

**States with Narrow Eligibility Criteria (Excluding At Risk)**
**Comparison of December 2004 Birth to 3 Child Count / 2004 Population Estimates**

| | |
|---|---|
| North Dakota | 2.80% |
| Montana | 2.13% |
| Oklahoma | 2.04% |
| Alaska | 2.02% |
| Arizona | 1.54% |
| **MISSOURI** | **1.53%** |
| District of Columbia | 1.30% |
| Nevada | 1.30% |
| National Baseline | 2.24% |

Source: Data from http://www.federalresourcecenter.org/frc/sppc.htm

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

See Indicator 5

While child count numbers in Missouri fluctuate from month to month and have increased over the past several years, the percentage served has leveled off to approximately 1.5% to 1.6% of the population. Based on data reviews that began in January 2005, consultants are contacting SPOEs with the lowest percentages served to identify causes for low child count and develop, in cooperation with LICCs and RICCs, a plan for targeted child find activities with referral sources that demonstrate low referral rates.

Referral source data show increases in the percentage of overall referrals from NICUs and parents. In 2003-04, there were 534 NICU referrals (8.2% of total First Steps referrals for that year) and 2,682 referrals from parents (41.2%). In 2004-05, there were 700 NICU referrals (12.1%) and 2,498 referrals from parents (43.1%).

Data on percentage of children served by SPOE is publicly reported in the SPOE Report which is posted on the web monthly.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **2005-2006** | 1.55% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 will have IFSPs |
| **2006-2007** | 1.57% |
| **2007-2008** | 1.59% |
| **2008-2009** | 1.61% |
| **2009-2010** | 1.64% |
| **2010-2011** | 1.67% |
| **2011-2012** | 1.67% |
| **2012-2013** | 1.67% |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

See Indicator 5

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

The responsibility for meeting the 45–day timeline in Missouri's Part C program rests with the System Point of Entry (SPOE). SPOEs employ Service Coordinators who respond to referrals, coordinate evaluation and assessment activities, conduct eligibility determination and develop the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). The Department provides guidance to the Service Coordinators on how to appropriately complete these activities to ensure that initial IFSPs are developed within the 45-day timeline. This guidance includes a checklist of required activities as well as best practice for working with families during the 45-day timeline.

In 2007 Missouri identified a need for statewide consistency in the utilization of a standardized evaluation tool, reporting results and determining eligibility for First Steps. Missouri identified the Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC) as a uniform instrument to assist with eligibility determination. Additionally, the current SPOE contract requires SPOE agencies to organize providers into Early Intervention Teams by designating specific providers to serve certain geographical areas, which will increase the availability of providers who conduct evaluations for eligibility determination and assessments for IFSP planning.

Service Coordinators complete data entry in the web-based child record system (i.e., WebSPOE), which enables "real-time" entry of key components such as dates, contact information, case notes and other relevant activities within the 45-day timeline. In order to determine that a child received his/her initial IFSP within the 45-day timeline, WebSPOE compares the date of referral to the date of the initial IFSP. If the difference of these dates is greater than 45 days, the child's name appears on the "Exceeding 45 Days" list. If the initial IFSP is not held on or before the 45th day, a reason for the delay must be entered into WebSPOE. Once the child's name appears on the list, the Service Coordinator must select the reason for exceeding the time frame from one of the following:

- Parent reason,
- SPOE reason,

- Provider reason,
- Provider unavailability.

If the reason was coded as unacceptable (i.e., SPOE or Provider reasons) then the Service Coordinator must address compensatory services with the family.

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

**2004-05 Referrals resulting in IFSPs**

| | |
|---|---|
| # IFSPs with acceptable timelines * | 2,120 |
| Total IFSPs | 2,860 |
| % with acceptable timelines | 75.4% |

* "Acceptable timelines" includes those evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within the 45-day timelines as well as those that went over 45 days due to parent or child reasons.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri's "IFSPs with acceptable timelines" data has significantly improved, from 51.2% in 2003-04 to 75.4% in 2004-05, with the period from January through August 2005 showing even more improvement (81.52%) than the 2004-05 year.

Missouri began collecting reasons for exceeding the 45 day timelines in January 2005 through paper reports from the SPOEs. The reasons for exceeding 45 days were built into the new web system to better analyze and address this compliance standard.

The percent reported in the three regions that have been under the new contract (Northwest, Greater St. Louis and St. Louis County) and who have evaluation teams is much better than the average in the remainder of the state. Evaluation teams will be in place statewide in early 2006 and are expected to further reduce 45 day timeline issues.

The new contracts specify 45-day timelines as a compliance standard, and liquidated damages will be applied from the first to third renewal periods for failing to meet the standard.

See Indicator 9 for a description of the monitoring system and corrective actions for SPOEs exceeding 45 day timelines.

Public reporting of data includes data on 45 day timelines by SPOE.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.1 Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs not in compliance with 45-day timeline requirements | 2008/09 – 2012/13 | LA staff and Area Directors, SPOEs | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 7.2 Provide training and professional development to SPOEs in the area of 45-day timelines | 2008/09 – 2012/13 | LA staff and Area Directors, SPOEs | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

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

The Department implements a number of activities to ensure a successful transition from Missouri Part C to Part B programs. Those activities include the following:

- Service Coordinators assist the families in planning and developing the transition conference. The Service Coordinator provides the family with a DVD and Transition handbook prior to discussing the meeting activities. During the planning period the Service Coordinator asks the family for permission to invite individuals who provide services after age three, examples include Lead Educational Agency (LEA), Head Start or other community preschool programs. Once the individuals are identified, and with parent permission, they are invited to the transition conference.
- The Service Coordinator notifies the LEA that the child is potentially eligible for Part B, unless the family declines, in writing, this notification.
- The web-based system (i.e., WebSPOE) provides detailed information on when transition meetings are held, who participated, and the discussion of the transition steps and services. WebSPOE also requires that certain actions be taken by Service Coordinators, such as documenting the person responsible for a specific transition step. For children on a Service Coordinator's caseload, WebSPOE will notify the Service Coordinator of approaching timelines for transition meetings by providing a list of upcoming dates.
- The Department provides training and technical assistance to SPOE and LEA staff in the form of online modules, face-to-face training every other spring and a website dedicated to Transition from Part C to Part B.

- The Department uses all of the above data in the monitoring process. Any identified noncompliance requires a corrective action and, if not corrected, sanctions will be imposed.

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

Data from 2004-05 has been compiled from monitoring reviews that occurred during 2004-05, using the sampled files that were reviewed. Data are compiled from initial and follow-up monitoring reviews in six SPOE regions, and include files reviewed for SPOEs, DMH and Independent Service Coordinators. See Indicator 9 for additional information on the monitoring process. As this data is from a limited number of SPOEs and a limited number of files reviewed, this data should not be considered representative of the state as a whole; it is reported because it is the only available data from 2004-05.

| | # of files reviewed | # in compliance | # out of compliance | % in compliance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A: IFSPs with transition steps and services | 98 | 45 | 53 | 45.9% |
| B: Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B | 96 | 44 | 52 | 45.8% |
| C: Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B | 97 | 45 | 52 | 46.4% |

Source – results of file reviews for Indicators 103600 (A), 103520 (B) and 103400 (C)

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

During 2004-05, transition was monitored for selected SPOEs and service coordinators, by looking at a sample of files. The intention of the monitoring was not to produce a percentage of children statewide, however, since the monitoring data is the only available data for 2004-05, this is the data reported as baseline. With implementation of the new web system, Missouri will be able to use the data system as a source of transition data as well as monitoring data. Therefore, future data reporting will use a different, more comprehensive source of data.

For A - IFSPs with transition steps and services: The web system requires that certain transition requirements be addressed, so monitoring of this area can examine the quality of the item rather than just look for its existence.

For B - Notification to LEA: Missouri regulations require parent consent prior to notification of the LEA. In order to make the notification process less cumbersome, the state will evaluate this requirement and consider using the web system data to notify school districts of the number of children who will potentially be referred on a quarterly basis.

For C - Transition conference: The web system records when the transition conference was held so that the number of children with transition conferences held within required timelines can be determined.

Corrective action plans were ordered for all SPOEs, DMH Regional Centers and independent service coordinators found out of compliance in any of these areas. Timelines for correction are as follows:

- For initial reviews, follow-up will occur nine months from the date of the final report letter, in approximately January 2006.
- For follow-up reviews, a second follow-up is being conducted in November and December 2005. Several SPOEs have corrected one or more of these indicators as of the date of this report.
- For initial reviews of DMH and Independent Service Coordinators (initial reviews), follow-up will occur nine months after the date of the final report letter, in approximately July 2006.

First Steps Consultants have been deployed to assist in implementing corrective action plans for SPOEs and DMH and are available to assist independent service coordinators. They will maintain close contact to monitor and report to the Department the improvements made and/or need for additional assistance.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| All Years | 100% of all children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning by their third birthday |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8.1 Provide training and professional development to all SPOE agencies to improve collaboration and coordination with families and school districts in the area of C to B Transition timelines. | 2007/08-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/10 |
| 8.2 Provide information on strategies for improving performance on this indicator | 2005/06-2012/13 | Office of Special Education Staff, RPDC Consultants | Active Revised 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS, ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN REVISED, ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ADDED AND ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS MOVED TO INDICATOR 2.**

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

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

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

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

**Supervision and Monitoring of Programs:** The Department, as lead agency, is responsible for the general administration, supervision and monitoring of programs and activities receiving assistance under Part C to ensure compliance with Part C regulations. Monitoring activities include data collection, analysis and reporting, and cyclical compliance reviews. The Department documents any findings of noncompliance and verifies timely correction of all noncompliance through written correspondence to agencies via the Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS).

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

Prior to 2009-10, APR data for compliance indicators 1, 7, and 8C were obtained from the early intervention database for every child in the five SPOE regions being monitored; and results for other compliance indicators, including 8A and 8B, were based on a review of the files of 15 children from each of the five SPOE regions during onsite monitoring.

In 2009-10, compliance indicators 1, 7, and 8A, 8B and 8C were monitored through a review of two files which were randomly selected from every Service Coordinator in each of the five SPOE regions scheduled for review. A reason for the change in monitoring procedures from reviewing 15 initial IFSPs and15 transition IFSPs per SPOE region was that service coordination numbers in smaller SPOE regions resulted in multiple files being reviewed for some service coordinators in the state, and Service Coordinators in other areas of the state having only one file, or in some cases, no files reviewed during the monitoring cycle.

In 2009-10, there were seven service coordinators in the smallest rural SPOE and 27 service coordinators in the largest urban SPOE. It was determined that reviewing one initial and one transition IFSP for each Service Coordinator provided a more accurate view of each SPOE.

Both timeline and compliance monitoring data are obtained from a review of two files from each Service Coordinator in the five SPOE regions being reviewed. SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional state standards and indicators.

**Follow-up Procedures and Correction of Noncompliance**: Per OSEP instructions, the State ensures that each SPOE agency with noncompliance identified from any source: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieve 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE, 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 SPOE agency's notification of the findings. State staff request additional data as part of the follow-up review. This data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and SPOEs may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified.

All findings of individual child noncompliance must be corrected at 100% within 60 days of the report of findings, unless the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of the program. State staff 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 SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed through various communications about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months.

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

These data were originally presented in three sections, but per instruction from OSEP, have been combined into one table with one overall percentage of noncompliance corrected within one year.

| SPP Indicator | # SPOE/ Agencies Reviewed 2003-04 | # SPOE/ Agencies with Findings 2003-04 | # Findings in SPOE/ Agencies 2003-04 | # Corrected within 1 Year | % Corrected within 1 Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. EI services in timely manner | 16 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100.0% |
| 2. EI services in natural environments | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100.0% |
| 3. Outcomes | New – No data | | | | |
| 4. Families | New – No data | | | | |
| 5. Percent birth to 1* | None | | | | |
| 6. Percent birth to 3* | None | | | | |
| 7. 45 day timelines | 16 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 33.3% |
| 8. Transition (3 Indicators) | 14 | 13 | 39 | 25 | 64.1% |
| Referral Process | 16 | 10 | 18 | 17 | 94.4% |
| Evaluation/Assess Procedures | 16 | 12 | 17 | 12 | 70.6% |
| IFSP | 16 | 11 | 25 | 24 | 96.0% |
| Child Complaint Allegations | | | 9 | 9 | 100.0% |
| Total | | | 124 | 95 | 76.6% |

***** Child find was not a specific contractual responsibility for SPOEs monitored during 2003-2004. Child find responsibilities are included in the new contracts. See Indicator 5 for more information.

Referral Process includes checking that written notice was provided, that the notice contained the appropriate content and that parental consent was obtained prior to the evaluation of the child.

Evaluation/Assessment Procedures includes checking that current health records and medical histories are present and that the basis for determination of eligibility and need for EI services is present.

IFSP includes checking that written notification was provided, that the required meeting participants participated, that the services to be provided are described, that required transition elements are addressed, that an annual meeting to evaluate the IFSP was held, the six month review if the IFSP occurs, and that prior written notice is provided for change of services.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Corrective action plans were ordered for all SPOEs found out of compliance in any of these areas during 2003-04 initial reviews. At the follow-up review, some noncompliance was not cleared as indicated in the tables above.

Two SPOEs have each corrected two transition indicators; however that data is not reflected in the above tables because the correction occurred two months beyond the one-year point. In addition, the review for two other SPOEs will not be completed until approximately mid-December, and it is possible the

Department will be able to verify correction of non-compliance in the areas of transition, evaluation/assessment, and IFSP that has occurred either within one year or shortly beyond one year.

Two SPOEs could not be reviewed in the area of Evaluation/Assessment procedures (basis for eligibility) because they are small SPOEs and had not received referrals in the eligibility categories necessary to review in order to verify correction of non-compliance. Due to this, these SPOEs are considered not cleared, but will be reviewed as soon as the necessary files are available.

The level of non-compliance in SPOEs was considered when awarding contracts for new SPOEs during the bid review and selection process. The new contractors will be notified through letters and direct contact from the Department regarding any areas of noncompliance still outstanding from previous SPOE agencies covering the new areas. The new contractors will be held responsible for the correction of any remaining noncompliance. Consultants will work closely with the new SPOEs and begin monitoring to verify completion as soon as the SPOEs are operational. New SPOE directors will participate in training in conjunction with start up operations and the compliance portion of the training will focus heavily on areas of noncompliance identified throughout the state.

Existing SPOE contractors that continue to operate SPOEs where non-compliance has not completely been corrected will also receive compliance training and technical assistance with special emphasis on areas of concern identified through monitoring.

Training for all SPOE directors (new and existing) is scheduled for January 2006, and ongoing compliance training and technical assistance will be provided, especially to SPOEs that continue to show non-compliance in one or more areas. Consultants will work with the Department to conduct ongoing monitoring to verify correction of any areas of non-compliance remaining. The Department will receive regular reports (at least monthly) from consultants in areas where non-compliance has not yet been corrected.

In general, the Department is aware that 45 day timelines is one area that needs attention and has put into place a number of changes with the new SPOE contract that are anticipated to help, along with placing high emphasis on this area through regular data reviews, technical assistance, targeted problem solving, and increased reporting requirements where appropriate. In addition, the Department recognizes that there are several areas of the state that continue to have difficulty with transition, and this is a targeted area for training and technical assistance. Beyond that, many SPOEs have corrected all non-compliance or have only minimal issues they are dealing with and they should be able to correct these in a reasonable period. The Department has identified three SPOE regions that have more significant problems, all of which will have new contractors.

The Department has closely reviewed results of monitoring and complaints and is in the process of working with the Consultants to revise technical assistance, training and procedure documents. The revised documents will incorporate specific information to target areas of systemic noncompliance.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.1 Provide training and professional development through Area Directors to SPOEs/ providers for development and implementation of corrective action plans | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.2 Manage/support a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. | 2010/11 – 2012/13 | LA Staff | Active<br>Added 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS, ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN REVISED AND ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ADDED.**

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

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

**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 Part C system. 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 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. 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.

Missouri has had a database for child complaint and due process information for several years. The database is used to maintain all data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

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

During 2004-05, eleven (11) child complaints were filed, of which ten (10) were investigated and one (1) was withdrawn. All decisions were issued within 60 calendar days.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri has historically been within timelines for all child complaints.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| All Years | 100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10.1 Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 10.2 Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders | 2010/11-2012/13 | LA Staff | Active<br>Added 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS, ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN REVISED AND ONE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ADDED.**

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

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

**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 single Hearing Officer for Part C. The Part C Hearing Officers are attorneys under contract with the State of Missouri. Requests for a Due Process Hearing must be made in writing to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Special Education.

Upon receipt of a request for a hearing, both parties are offered the opportunity for mediation. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on a trained mediator from a list that is provided. If mediation is successful, a written agreement is developed. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings.

If either party does not agree with the hearing decision, they may appeal the findings and decision in either state or federal court. The decision of the Due Process Hearing Officer is a final decision, unless a party to the hearing appeals.

Missouri has had a database for child complaint and due process information for several years. The database is used to store all data related to due process cases and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

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

During 2004-05, two due process hearing requests were received. Both had decisions issued within appropriately extended timelines.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri has historically been within timelines for all due process hearings.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11.1 Manage current program to maintain compliance with applicable timelines for resolution of due process hearing requests | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 11.2 Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders | 2010/11-2012/13 | LA Staff | Active<br>Added 2/11 |

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

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

See Indicator 1

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

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

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

**THIS INDICATOR IS NOT APPLICABLE FOR MISSOURI**

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

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

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

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

Not applicable

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Not applicable

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| All Years | Not applicable |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Not applicable

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

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

See Indicator 1

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

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

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

**THIS INDICATOR IS REPEATED WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE 2/10 SPP**

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

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

See Indicator 11. These data are collected in the child complaint/due process database.

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

There were no mediations requests during 2004-05.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

No mediations have been held in Missouri during the past three years.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | No targets are set due to lack of baseline data. |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Not applicable due to lack of mediation requests. Per OSEP, the state is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

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

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

See Indicator 1

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / 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). IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN REVISED AS A RESULT OF AN EVALUATION PROCESS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Missouri utilizes a web-based child data system, called WebSPOE. This system captures virtually every data element in the Part C system and contains information on referral, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and review. The system is compliance-driven and requires critical data items to conduct edit checks on data to help ensure accuracy. The system supplies data that can be reviewed at the SPOE and state levels for program evaluation and monitoring purposes.

Various efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy of data entered by the SPOEs into the data system:

- Each SPOE is the electronic record-keeper for the children served in their area. System requirements demand accurate and timely data entry at the child level in order for the children to have valid authorizations for services.
- The Department accesses a database that contains the child and family data in WebSPOE including demographics, eligibility determination, IFSP information and service authorization data, among other items. This database is used to aggregate and disaggregate data through Access queries for federal reporting purposes, and data is monitored for irregularities through various query results.
- SPOE data reports are posted on the web monthly. These reports contain referral information, child counts, IFSP and inactivation data by SPOE, among others. Posting this report has encouraged more accurate data entry.
- Technical assistance from the CFO Help Desk supports more accurate data entry.
- Data is being used for
    - File selection and data verification in on-site monitorings
    - Identification of specific issues for the Area Directors to work with SPOEs, Service Coordinators and providers
    - Fiscal data reviews and investigations

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

All 618 data reports and annual performance reports have been submitted on or before due dates. Accuracy of data is ensured through the efforts described above, the most important being the source document reviews during on-site monitoring, publication of the data and investigation of questionable data.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Missouri's new web-based child data system contains virtually all elements of the First Steps process from referral through IFSP. The electronic record is now considered the official Early Intervention record for a child and reviews will include checking the electronic data against source documents.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|---|---|
| **All Years** | 100% of State reported data will be timely and accurate |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14.1 Support the development and implementation of the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and the webSPOE data system | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |
| 14.2 Provide information to Area Directors and SPOE Directors regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA | 2005/06 – 2012/13 | LA Staff, Area Directors | Active<br>Revised 2/11 |