MO
Part B

FFY2013
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

General Supervision System:

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

General Supervision

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

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

INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES

In 2011-12, the Missouri Department of Education (Department) initiated a three-year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education. The Department implemented a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. All federal programs within the Department are part of the monitoring process. The objectives of the tiered monitoring process include:

· Reduce the time spent in LEAs conducting on-site monitoring reviews

· Improve quality and efficiency of on-site reviews

· Increase the number of LEAs given formal review

· Increase the number of LEAs meeting compliance

· Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

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

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

· Desk audit – a desk audit uses data reported through the state's data collection systems to annually monitor 100% of LEAs. Data include, but are not limited to, teacher certification, highly qualified teacher status, financial data (including maintenance of effort, CEIS budget applications, single audit findings, payment requests, final expenditure reports) discipline, disproportionate representation, graduation rate, dropout rate, post secondary transition, early childhood outcomes, dispute resolution and student performance.

· Desk review – conducted on a three-year cycle through a self-assessment monitoring checklist and verification of the checklist. The self-assessment information is collected and reported through the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS).

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

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

MONITORING FOR PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS)

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

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

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

MONITORING FOR COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. A LEA may not use more than 15% of the amount the agency receives under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced by the agency under

adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department through 1) the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER.

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

MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE

As indicated above, the Department implements a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill both state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The Special Education Finance Section uses the tiered monitoring process to review LEAs for fiscal compliance of IDEA Part B federal funds, along with other special education funding sources.

All LEAs, regardless of which cohort the LEA is assigned to, will go through the desk audit and application review level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, and final expenditure reports (FERs).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

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

STATE COMPLIANCE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

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

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

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

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

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

- Special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development to both special and general education teachers and administrators and provide ongoing coaching related to improving performance for students with disabilities.

• Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor LEA SW-PBS coaches/facilitators and otherwise support LEAs in implementation of SW-PBS.

• Compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to LEAs to assist them with IDEA compliance requirements, compliance self-assessments, as well as writing and implementing CAPs.

• Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.

• Collaborative Work (CW) consultants provide professional development, technical assistance and coaching to CW buildings/LEAs in collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making and effective teaching practices aligned with the CW.

• Professional Learning Community (PLC) consultants identify and recruit LEAs and buildings for PLC implementation, train LEA leadership, train and mentor building/LEA PLC coaches/facilitators and otherwise support buildings/LEAs in implementation of PLC.

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

Project ACCESS

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

Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities.

Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs). Currently, there are 34 MACs and 591 IDACs serving LEAs throughout the state.

The Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD. BEAT coaches are chosen and trained to aid specific LEAs based on Project ACCESS criteria, which includes significant knowledge and expertise in ASD and reflect Project ACCESS' philosophy toward education of children with ASD. BEAT coaches visit LEAs five to six times throughout the school year. The Coach collaborates with the IDAC along with other LEA staff to observe students, assist with assessments, model consultation strategies, and provide related coaching activities.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (MSB) OUTREACH SERVICES

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

• Deaf/blind Technical Assistance Program

• Library Media Center

• Missouri Instructional Resource Center

• MoSPIN*

• Professional Development

• Service Provider Listings

• Vision Education and Orientation & Mobility

*Missouri Statewide Parent Involvement Network (MoSPIN): Since 1987, MSB has been providing MoSPIN, a statewide home-based program, to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired. MoSPIN provides direct, in-home parent education across the state through specially trained "parent advisors." The program is designed for parents of children who are visually impaired and who may also have other disabilities (developmental delay, hearing impairment, motor impairment, etc.). MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct service to the child. Parents choose to be active learners in this home-based program.

MISSOURI SCHOOLS FOR THE SEVERELY DISABLED (MSSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

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

• Regionally-based resource libraries

• Technical assistance

• LEA staff development related to instructional practice, curriculum and assessment

• IEP tecnical assistance specific to a student

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF (MSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

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

· American Sign Language (ASL) classes

· Families First--an early intervention program serving families of deaf and hard of hearing children from birth through age 8

· Parent advisors--professionals in a deaf-related field such as deaf education, speech pathology, audiology, or ASL interpreting

· Audiology services

· Newborn hearing screening (required for all children)

· Comprehensive hearing evaluations

· Auditory Processing Disorder testing

· Hearing aid selection counseling, programming, fitting, cleaning, and repair

· Hearing aid bank

· FM System leases

· Speech-language assessments

· Community education and professional development--workshops, in-service training, and informational presentations for LEAs, hospitals and clinics, and parent and community organizations.

· The Shared Reading Project--supports literacy and language acquisition by helping parents learn to read to their deaf or hard of hearing child in ASL. Books and accompanying materials are loaned to families, and specially trained deaf adults tutor parents in effective ways to read to their deaf and hard of hearing children.

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERITY (MSU) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

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

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

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

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

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

• State Coordinator

• Data/Web Consultant

• Secondary/Tertiary Consultants

• Regional Consultants

The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop statewide standardized training for various audiences at the building, LEA, regional, and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the National Center on

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the Missouri University (MU) PBIS Center, both of which are supported by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

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

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

COLLABORATIVE WORK (CW)

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

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

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

· Teachers set learning intentions and success criteria aligned to Missouri Teaching/Learning Standards.

· Teachers use effective instructional practices, conduct frequent checks for understanding, and provide specific feedback.

· Students are taught how the learning intentions and success criteria are relevant and applicable, to articulate the extent to which learning has occurred, and identify needs for additional practice.

Implementation

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

Commitment to Implementation Integrity

· Selection, mastery and implementation of a variety of effective instructional practices which have been proven to have a high effect on student outcomes

· Development and administration of common formative assessments (CFA) by grade-level and aligned to the Missouri Learning Standards of mathematics/English Language Arts at least five times annually.

· Efficient and effective Collaborative Data teams at the building level using classroom data to make instructional decisions

· Monthly reports of data analysis:

o Practice used

o Number of students assessed

o Number/% of students and students with disabilities in level of proficient, close to proficient, far to go (likely to become proficient), and Intervention students (not likely to become proficient)

o Re-teaching practice

o Re-test results

Implementation Expectations

· All work will be aligned with the Missouri Learning Standards and Teacher/Leader Standards

· Building administrator will:

o assure that the participation expectations and agreements have been shared with all instructional staff

o assure that all instructional staff will be trained and participate on building collaborative data teams and provide support to instructional staff who have expertise in an effective teaching practice to coach and mentor colleagues

o support and oversee the collaborative team process

o new staff will be trained/mentored on the collaborative work

· All teachers (including Special Education and special subjects [music, art, physical education., etc] will actively participate on a collaborative teacher team

o Small buildings may only have one team covering all grade levels.

o Larger buildings may have two or more teams—some could have one per grade level.

· Each building will

o identify a content area of English/language arts or mathematics to focus their attention and to report progress

o select the “effective” teaching/learning practices for the year that all teachers will agree to use as part of the teaching/learning process.

· Each building level collaborative data team will

o develop, administer, score and analyze results of grade appropriate common formative assessments aligned to a core academic standard.

Inclusion of students with IEPs in CFAs

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

Professional Development System:

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

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

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

State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

In October 2012, the state was awarded a new five-year SPDG. This SPDG is using lessons learned from the prior grant to

begin implementing a more focused school improvement process (the Missouri Collaborative Work [CW]) with an emphasis on High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) at the state, regional, LEA and building levels. The CW has four major areas of focus: Collaborative Data Teams, Effective Teaching/Learning Practices, Formative Assessment and Data-based Decision-making (see "Collaborative Work" above). During the 2012-13 school year, 270 buildings (mostly elementary buildings) volunteered to participate in the CW project. In 2013-14, 90 buildings were added for a total of 370, including middle and high schools. School year 2014-15 had 358 buildings participate. Professional development in the four focus areas has been developed and used to train state and regional PD providers who disseminate the information to staff in the identified buildings. Building staff form collaborative data teams that identify effective teaching/learning practices to implement in a selected area (English/language arts or math). All staff are trained in the practice. After training, staff develop and administer Common Formative Assessments to measure student progress and using a data team process, identify students for re-teaching and retesting. A cadre of State Implementation Specialists (SIS) have been trained and are evaluating the activities of the project to ensure that all activities meet standards of HQPD and are implemented with fidelity at all levels of the system to meet OSEP's standards for HQPD. The overall goal of this project is improved outcomes for all students, but especially for students with disabilities.

DLM

The Department has trained staff in the Office of College and Career Readiness (OCCR), Assessment Section and the OSE on the administration of the DLM Assessment, as well as the instructional support system which accompanies the assessment. These staff regularly train the RPDC Improvement Consultants on this same information so consultants can effectively train LEAs in their region. All regional consultants have access to the DLM online training system and have allocated regular blocks of time to completing all of the modules.

DESIRED RESULTS DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE (DRDP) ©

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

ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM ACTIVITIES

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

- Project ACCESS
- MSB
- MSSD
- MSD
- MPACT

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The OSE solicits input from the SEAP in all areas related to the state's SSIP and the SPP/APR. The SEAP is dedicated to their involvement in discussions related to activities designed to improve compliance and student outcomes, targets to measure progress, and annual/trend data related to meeting the targets. To formalize these discussions, the OSE annually schedules a comprehensive discussion of performance activities, targets for the year, and current/ trend progress data. Information is sent to the SEAP prior to the meeting to give them a chance to review materials and identify questions that remain. The process at the meeting involves an overview of the SPP/APR purposes and process (especially important for new members) followed by more detailed discussions of improvement activities

(see Attachment), targets and progress. The Panel is encouraged to provide comments during the discussion phase but is also asked to discuss the activities, targets and progress in their small committee meetings. This model has proven to be effective especially for those members who are hesitant to speak in the large session. Most find their voices in the smaller committee groups. As a sidenote, OSEP's changes to the reporting system and our interest in reducing the complexity of the reports and data seemed to have improved the engagement of the committee.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Public Reporting of LEA Data

Public reports of 2013-14 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (the Department) Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal website. The Special Education Profiles are posted under Summary Reports (top right box of reports) at http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state.

Public Reporting of Statewide Data

The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the Department's website at http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/moprofile.pdf as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.

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

OSEP Response

OSEP's FFY 2012 Response Table indicated that the State's data for prior Indicator 15 (timely correction of findings of noncompliance) were not valid and reliable because the State reported findings of noncompliance for Indicators 4A and 4B that are were not accounted for in Indicator 15. OSEP explained that the State indicated in Indicator 4A that there were two findings of noncompliance reported for one LEA and in Indicator 4B there were 118 district-level findings of noncompliance reported for 77 students in nine LEAs (based on data from 2009-10 and 2010-11) identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. However, in the Indicator 15 Worksheet on page 70 of the clarified FFY 2012 APR, the State reported for 4A and 4B combined only two monitoring findings in two LEAs and three dispute resolution findings in three LEAs. The Response Table required the State to report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR for Indicator 4A and 4B the number of LEAs issued findings in FFY 2011, the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and the number of findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified later than one year from identification. The State was required to account for all findings reported in FFY 2011 under Indicator 4A and 4B. In an attachment to the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State provided the required information, showing the correct number of findings identified in FFY 2011 for Indicators 4A and 4B, and that all of these findings had been corrected, thus providing all of the required information.

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,850	5850
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,974	7,974
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	73.36%	Calculate

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
5,850	7,974	72.80%	71.50%	73.36%

Graduation Conditions Field

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

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

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

· Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.

· Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:

1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.

2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.

3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcripted in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.

· Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.

· Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
961	32,886	4.00%	4.80%	2.92%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State revised the baseline year for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
Data	32.20%	10.60%	18.30%	25.10%	21.30%	17.50%	0.60%	0.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

(●) Yes ( ) No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

( ) AYP (●) AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
566	315	0	0.60%	37.00%	0%

Explanation of Slippage

With the 2011-12 APR, Missouri changed from reporting on percent of districts meeting AYP to percent of districts meeting AMO's. This was due to the US Department of Education's approval of Missouri's ESEA Flexibility request. There were multiple ways to meet AYP (confidence intervals, safe harbor, growth, etc.), but AMO is determined solely by the percent of students meeting the proficiency target. The proficiency target for students with disabilities is the same level of proficiency for all students. Due to the rigorous targets established for all students, no districts met the target for both reading and mathematics for students with disabilities.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State revised the baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	61,329	61,047	99.50%	95.00%	99.54%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	61,670	61,359	99.50%	95.00%	99.50%

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple places:

State level data: http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/Assessment.pdf

State and LEA level data: http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx
Select district. In top right box select Special Education Profiles and go to page 6. In bottom right box, select any of the options under Missouri Assessment Program, make dropdown selections (select All), click View Report.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	23.20%	25.00%	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	26.40%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	61,047	14,175	25.80%	23.20%	23.22%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

	score and a proficiency was assigned				
A Overall	61,359	16,237	28.40%	26.40%	26.46%

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment data are available in multiple places:

State level data: http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/Assessment.pdf

State and LEA level data: http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx
Select district. In top right box select Special Education Profiles and go to page 6. In bottom right box, select any of the options under Missouri Assessment Program, make dropdown selections (select All), click View Report.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	535	0.40%	1.80%	0.19%

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

- ( ) Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- (●) The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2012-13 school year, which is

the data year for this indicator. In addition, the Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA-Part B requirements and receive IDEA-Part B dollars directly, the agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4A:

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

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

- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR for Indicator 4A and 4B the number of LEA's issued findings in FFY 2011, the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and the number of findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified later than one year from identification. The State must account for all findings reported in FFY 2011 under Indicator 4A and 4B.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

No responses unrelated to correction of findings were required.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Data for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data. Monitoring procedures specify that the first year a district meets the criteria to be identified as having a significant discrepancy in discipline rates, based on two consecutive years of data, the district is subject to a comprehensive review of policies, procedures and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The comprehensive review consists of a district self-assessment, student file reviews, and interviews with district staff to verify data. For each subsequent, consecutive year that a district's data indicates a significant discrepancy in discipline

rates, the district will participate in a modified review. The modified review consists of a district self-assessment and interviews to verify data with district staff. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the district's discipline policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Should the district be identified for a period of five consecutive years, the year following the fifth year, the district will begin a new five year monitoring cycle and again be subject to a comprehensive review.

The one district identified as having significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A participated in the modified review process.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The OSE identified two LEAs as having a significant discrepancy in the suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A. One LEA identified as having a significant discrepancy in the suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4A was required by the OSE to participate in a modified review process. The monitoring review indicated that the discrepancy was not a result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices.

The OSE required the second LEA to participate in a comprehensive review process and identified two findings related to discipline procedures and practices that did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This one LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to include a review of procedures and practices. There were no findings related to policies. The district provided documentation of its revised procedures and practices and training of staff on those revisions. Through this follow-up process, the state verified that the LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

Also included within this CAP for the second LEA was the requirement to include documentation of correction of individual noncompliance. As a result of this review, the district provided documentation of correction of individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance allowed for by the IDEA. Through this follow-up process, the state verified that the LEA with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State revised its baseline year to FFY 2005 and OSEP accepts this revision.

Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
3	0	535	0.20%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2012-13 school year, which is the data year for this indicator. In addition, the Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA-Part B requirements and receive IDEA-Part B dollars directly, the agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is

the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy for Indicator 4B:

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

• Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities in the racial/ethnic group (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to

• Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students of all racial/ethnic groups (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR for Indicator 4A and 4B the number of LEA's issued findings in FFY 2011, the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and the number of findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified later than one year from identification. The State must account for all findings reported in FFY 2011 under Indicator 4A and 4B.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

No responses unrelated to correction of findings were required.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The OSE identified nine LEAs as having a significant discrepancy in the suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4B. The OSE required two of the identified LEAs to participate in a comprehensive review process. Of those two LEAs, one had no findings of noncompliance and the other was found to have nine district level findings of noncompliance regarding policies, procedures and practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, and this district was found not in compliance with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This one LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to include a review of policies, procedures and practices. The district provided documentation of its revised policies, procedures and practices and training of staff on those revisions. Through this follow-up process, the state verified that the LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

The other seven LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy in the suspension/expulsion rates for Indicator 4B were required to participate in a modified review process. This monitoring review indicated that the discrepancy was not a result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices.

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

Also included in the CAP of the one LEA with findings of noncompliance, the LEA was to include documentation of correction for one finding of individual noncompliance. The district provided documentation of correction of the individual noncompliance as well as a follow-up sample of student files demonstrating correction of the identified noncompliance within the twelve month timeframe for correction of noncompliance allowed for by the IDEA. Through this follow-up process, the state verified that the LEA with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e.achieved 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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%
Target B ≤	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
Target C ≤	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	107,245	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,305	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,769	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	3,198	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	n	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	689	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,305	107,245	58.10%	56.00%	58.10%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,769	107,245	9.40%	10.20%	9.11%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,891	107,245	3.50%	3.70%	3.63%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State revised the baselines for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								47.30%
		Data							47.20%	47.20%
B	2011	Target ≤								22.80%
		Data							22.90%	22.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	47.30%
Target B ≤	32.00%	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	22.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

The SEAP was presented two sets of targets for Indicator 6, one based on the 3-5 data (including Kindergarten), and one with the Kindergarten students removed. They gravitated strongly to the data which did not include the kindergarten students since that is a true representation of our early childhood programs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,047	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,544	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,431	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	208	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,544	16,047	47.20%	29.00%	47.01%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,639	16,047	22.90%	32.00%	22.68%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	93.83%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.90%
Target A2 ≥	48.10%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	48.20%
Target B1 ≥	95.48%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.50%
Target B2 ≥	40.51%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	40.60%
Target C1 ≥	93.48%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.50%
Target C2 ≥	56.79%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	56.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4,902

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	66
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	176
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,302
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,378
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	980

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3,680	3,922	94.10%	93.83%	93.83%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,358	4,902	51.30%	48.10%	48.10%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	97
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	106
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,713
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,571
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	415

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4,284	4,487	96.60%	95.48%	95.48%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1,986	4,902	43.30%	40.51%	40.51%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	72
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	175
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,871

	Number of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,672
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,112

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3,543	3,790	93.90%	93.48%	93.48%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,784	4,902	59.50%	56.79%	56.79%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

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

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

• ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been compiled. However, the State of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June of 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the recommended instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, training began for ECSE staff in the administration of this assessment. ECSE staff will begin voluntary usage of the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year.

• The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) is used to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at http://dese.mo.gov/data-system-management/special-education-data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training.

• The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department.

• Each eligible child entering ECSE beginning October 2006 must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least six months.

• No sampling is used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed.

• Entry and exit data must be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively.

• A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely."

• All entry and exit data collected during a given year must be submitted electronically to the Department at the end of that

year.

• The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

• More information can be obtained at http://dese.mo.gov/data-system-management/special-education-data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Percentages for each of the outcome areas are as follows:

	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
a.	66	1.3%	97	2.0%	72	1.5%
b.	176	3.6%	106	2.2%	175	3.6%
c.	2302	47.0%	2713	55.3%	1871	38.2%
d.	1378	28.1%	1571	32.0%	1672	34.1%
e.	980	20.0%	415	8.5%	1112	22.7%
Total	4902	100.0%	4902	100.0%	4902	100.0%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Progress and actual target data for FFY 2013 are reported.

OSEP Response

The State revised the baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
3,383	4,540	77.60%	70.00%	74.52%

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

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

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 4% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

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

The 2014 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected through the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 189 LEAs (cohort) that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes.

Each cohort includes approximately one-third of the LEAs in the state (including public charter schools and other public agencies responsible for provision of educational services). LEAs in each cohort were selected based on size within each region and across the state. This assured an equal distribution of the 566 districts in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium and small districts from urban, suburban and rural settings. Districts in each cohort also represent the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

A total of 4,540 surveys were completed, 2,352 by mail and 2,188 electronically. The return rate for the 2013-14 data was 11.5% which was a slight increase over the prior year.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- (●) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- ( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	537	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

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

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2013-14 school year. The Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA-Part B requirements and receive IDEA-Part B dollars directly, the agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
5	0	537	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

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

The number of districts has been overwritten to reflect the number of applicable districts for the 2013-14 school year. The Revised Statutes of Missouri, Chapter 162RSMo. (http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/statutesAna.html#T11) contains the enabling legislation required, in conjunction with the provisions of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, to meet the federal and state mandates for appropriate educational services for students with disabilities. One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825 RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA-Part B requirements and receive IDEA-Part B dollars directly, the agency identified for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 is the "special school district" itself and not the specific component district(s). This practice is employed across SPP indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 for consistency. Therefore, the component districts for each special school district are not included in the total count of school districts for these indicators.

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7,607	7,530	97.60%	100%	98.99%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	77

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

Delays for the 77 children ranged from one day to 119 days. The longest delays were due in part to excessive numbers of snow days, school breaks and inability to contact parents. While these reasons are considered acceptable extensions to the timelines, the reasons did not fully explain the total delay so districts were cited for noncompliance with the timelines.

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ○ **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ◉ **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

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

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

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

These data were gathered in the web-based IMACS. Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

• Student's initials

• Date of parental consent to evaluate

• Date of eligibility

• Student eligible Y/N

• Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)

• If No, reason for delay

• Acceptable reason Y/N

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

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

• Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather (per State Regulation)

• Agency vacation days (per State Regulation)

• Child's absence because of illness (per State Regulation)

• Summer break (per State Regulation)

• Parent refuses/fails to produce child (per 300.301(d))

• Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
121	121	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR. Data reflecting the 2011-12 school year, and reported in the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2012, which is FFY 2012.

In FFY2012, there were 121 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children with initial evaluations. The state verified through this follow-up that all 37 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY2012, there were 121 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 37 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 37 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 121 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	618
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	70
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	505
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	34
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	505	511	93.90%	100%	98.83%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	6

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

For the six children for whom the IEP was not developed by the third birthday, the delays ranged from three days to 23 days. Reasons for the delays included late referrals from Part C and parent delays in scheduling meetings. One delay was due to waiting for staff to return from summer break.

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

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

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

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

Data for 2013-14 were gathered in the web-based IMACS which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

• Student's initials

• Date of birth

• Date of referral

• Parental Consent Received (Y/N)

• Date of eligibility

• Student eligible? (Y/N)

• Date of IEP

• IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)

• If No, reason for delay

• Acceptable reason Y/N

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR. Data reflecting the 2011-12 school year, and reported in the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2012, which is FFY 2012.

In FFY2012, there were 16 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 13 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children who transitioned from Part C to Part B. The state verified through this follow-up that all 13 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY2012, there were 16 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 13 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 13 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 16 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
709	800	87.50%	100%	88.63%

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

- (●) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

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

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all districts are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

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

• Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?

• Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?

• Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

• Is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?

• Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?

• Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

• Were the transition services developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests?

• Is there evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed?

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
140	140	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data above correspond to the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR. Data reflecting the 2011-12 school year, and reported in the FFY 2011 (2011-12) APR, resulted in findings issued in fall 2012, which is FFY 2012.

In FFY2012, there were 140 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 100 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of IEP secondary transition plan data. The state verified through this follow-up that all 100 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In FFY2012, there were 140 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 100 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 100 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 140 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
Target B ≥	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
Target C ≥	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,352
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,142
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,947
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	231
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	134

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,142	7,352	29.20%	24.40%	29.13%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,089	7,352	53.50%	46.90%	55.62%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,454	7,352	57.70%	51.30%	60.58%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	14	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	37	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
14	37	41.03%	35.30%	37.84%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri's primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). This panel annually reviews and makes recommendations related to the State's SPP/APR submission. This year's discussion of the targets included a rationale for changing some of the targets and baselines. They were very supportive of the changes recommended as they perceived that the recommended targets were more realistic and more meaningful for looking at real progress of students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	11	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	20	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	11	20	94.29%	35.30%	90.00%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	17.40%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	18.40%	19.40%	20.90%	22.40%	23.90%

Description of Measure

See uploaded document.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See uploaded document.

Data Analysis

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

See uploaded document.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

See uploaded document.

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

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

Statement

See uploaded document.

Description

See uploaded document.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

See uploaded document.

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☐ **Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Stephen Barr

Title: Assistant Commissioner

Email: stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov

Phone: 573-751-5739