

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 79.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 79.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 74.5%.</p> <p>Missouri was not able to calculate the graduation rate as established under the ESEA for any groups of students. The State will begin using the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) graduation rate calculation for the 2010 –11 graduates. This calculation will be reported with the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013. .</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4.9%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. 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 targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 17.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 21.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 37%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.3% for reading and 99.2% for math. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.7% for reading and 99.6% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 27% for reading and 29.6% for math. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 26.2% for reading and 29.2% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 75.5% for reading and 72.5% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0.5%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 503 of 561 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten or more discipline incidents for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s effort to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011 based on FFY 2009 data. The State also reported that four districts were identified as having policies,</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether districts with 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, based on FFY 2009 data, had policies,</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The State reported that 508 of 561 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten or more discipline incidents for students with disabilities in one or more racial/ethnic categories.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected districts to revise the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011 based on FFY 2009 data.</p>	<p>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, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that these districts have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 865 1583 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">58.4</td> <td align="center">58.6</td> <td align="center">59.5</td> <td align="center">0.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">9.6</td> <td align="center">9.3</td> <td align="center">10.2</td> <td align="center">0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.7</td> <td align="center">3.6</td> <td align="center">3.5</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58.4	58.6	59.5	0.20%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.6	9.3	10.2	0.30%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.7	3.6	3.5	0.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58.4	58.6	59.5	0.20%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.6	9.3	10.2	0.30%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.7	3.6	3.5	0.10%																		

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C.																	
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.	The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.																
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 878 1583 1494"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="550 878 959 980"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 878 1163 980"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 878 1373 980"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 878 1583 980"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 980 959 1162">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 980 1163 1162">91.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 980 1373 1162">93.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 980 1583 1162">92.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1162 959 1382">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1162 1163 1382">93.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1162 1373 1382">95.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1162 1583 1382">93.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1382 959 1494">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1382 1163 1494">91.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1382 1373 1494">93.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1382 1583 1494">90.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	91.9	93.9	92.7	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	93.5	95.6	93.8	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to	91.2	93.0	90.7	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	91.9	93.9	92.7															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	93.5	95.6	93.8															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to	91.2	93.0	90.7															

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	meet their needs (%)				
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	53.5	51.7	55.6	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	42.1	40.8	42.4	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	59.4	57.0	60.7	
These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.					
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 71.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 69.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 80%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that 443 of 563 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 20 students in one or more racial and ethnic groups and at least 20 students in the comparison group of all other racial and ethnic groups.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that 497 of 563 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 20 students in one or more disability and racial and ethnic groups and at least 20 students in the disability and comparison group of all other racial and ethnic groups.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%. The State reported that all 322 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 79.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 91.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that all 72 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 329 1583 1114"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">23.38</td> <td align="center">30.2</td> <td align="center">24.4</td> <td align="center">0.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">45.94</td> <td align="center">53.1</td> <td align="center">46.9</td> <td align="center">0.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">50.33</td> <td align="center">58.6</td> <td align="center">51.3</td> <td align="center">0.08%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	23.38	30.2	24.4	0.07%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45.94	53.1	46.9	0.07%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	50.33	58.6	51.3	0.08%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	23.38	30.2	24.4	0.07%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45.94	53.1	46.9	0.07%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	50.33	58.6	51.3	0.08%																		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 785 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011</p>																				

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 19.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 55.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 35.3%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 95.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 90%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 35.3%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance</p>

Missouri Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%.</p>	<p>with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>