



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _H323A070017_____

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) and its partners (e.g., Ten (10) Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC), Missouri Parents ACT (MPACT) the Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (PTI), Missouri Schoolwide-Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), University of Missouri OSEP Center for Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (MU SW-PBS), University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) Institute for Human Development, and the University of Kansas (KU)) are charged with the goal of improving statewide and district level systems of educational support for children and youth with disabilities. Critical targeted areas for special education in Missouri include improving the elementary achievement and post-secondary transition of students with disabilities. To address these issues, a process has been developed to assist buildings and districts to integrate multi-tiered interventions for improving academics and behavior across the school system through a school reform process surrounding eleven essential features. The Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) framework was developed in 2007-08 and has been implemented with fidelity from 2008 to the present with 25 pilot schools in 14 districts across Missouri. The MIM is aligned with and intentionally complements key state and federal accountability reporting requirements (e.g., Missouri State Performance Plan (SPP), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B, and No Child Left Behind (NCLB)).

During the reporting period, the MIM Management Team, Implementation Team, and seven Implementation Facilitators (IFs) or coaches have been closely involved with helping schools and districts translate their extensive self study results and data into meaningful action plans that are implemented with fidelity to both the action plan and specific interventions. All 25 pilot schools implemented individualized action plans that described their goals, action steps, resources, data sources, budget, and timeline. All action plans contained goals and action steps with multiple, overlapping essential features. The seven IFs support specific pilot schools/districts within their region, and collaborate regularly with each other, the MIM Management Team, and the RPDCs to guide the districts' data-driven needs assessment process and assist the districts in building shared and collaborative leadership through professional development.

The initial intention of the MIM was to initiate a school improvement model in 14 pilot districts first in key schools, then in multiple schools, and finally district-wide. During this reporting period, 11 additional schools, including middle and high schools, were added to the project. To support the MIM schools/districts, the MIM Management Team, Implementation Facilitators and MIM Implementation Team developed and provided ongoing professional development. All agendas and materials are archived online at www.MIMschools.org. In fall 2010 and spring 2011, veteran and new school and district leadership teams from all 14 pilot districts participated in four regional training meetings to meet role-alike (e.g., administrators meet with administrators from other schools/districts), share critical information, and learn about data reporting and collection. Schools learned how to upload progress monitoring data (minimum 3 times per year), behavioral referral data, and other critical data points for tracking the progress of the MIM. These same teams also participated in the MIM Summer Institute in July, 2010.

To assure fidelity to teaming and the MIM Processes, a MIM Process Checklist containing 24 items was developed in 2010 and results were submitted early spring, 2011. Implementation schools (2008-12 cohort) clearly have building leadership teams with recommended members that meet monthly, and includes administration, defined meeting roles, team norms, structure, notes and materials. Additionally, these schools disseminate information widely, understand the MIM components and processes, administer the MIM School Staff Survey annually, reflect on needs identified in the self-study process, and collaboratively develop and implement an action plan addressing key needs. For the newer 2010-12 cohort, middle and high schools have developed building leadership teams that meet monthly and include administration, with an identified process for reaching team decision. Meeting structure and organizational systems are in place, MIM information is shared with other administrators district-wide and the MIM School Staff Survey is administered to all building staff.

Because the MIM is in the fourth year of a five year pilot process, the MIM Management Team is very interested in understanding initial impact of the model. Over the past three years, participating MIM schools have

steadily increased student impact each year such as: students with disabilities proficiency or better in communication arts, students with disabilities proficiency or better in math, percentage of students with disabilities who are inside the regular class at least 80% of the day, and graduation rate for students with disabilities. Furthermore, the dropout rate for students with disabilities in participating districts has decreased steadily over the past three years. In regard to teacher-level impact, staff in MIM schools have increased participation in research-based, ongoing professional development consistently over the past three years. Scores increased in nearly every item in the School Staff Survey, illustrating a higher individual adoption of the eleven essential features for both general and special educators. Clearly, there is an increase in staff reporting use of data-based decision-making, collaboration, and overall job satisfaction.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Goal 1: To enhance the capacity of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and Regional Professional Development Centers to support the development, implementation and evaluation of a targeted system of professional development at the regional, district, and school levels in an effort to improve educational achievement and outcomes for children and youth with disabilities

Objective 1.1: To develop an integrated 3-tiered model process for pilot and eventual scale-up in Missouri.

1.1a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
		Target			Actual Performance Data			
Percentage of MIM developmental tasks and activities that have reached a level of goal attainment of 0 (expected outcome).	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
			6/6		100.0		5/5	100.0

1.1b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
		Target			Actual Performance Data			
Percentage of RPDCs participating in the ongoing Missouri Implementation Team meetings. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #2.1]	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
			9/9		100.0		9/10	90.0

1.1a A Goal Attainment Scale was developed to evaluate the level of attainment in the development phase of the MIM during the reporting period. In Goal Attainment Scaling methodology, 0 represents the expected outcome with -1 and -2 representing *less-than-expected outcomes* and +1 and +2 representing *greater than expected outcomes*. Goals to evaluate the MIM implementation process for the 10-11 reporting year were discussed by the MIM Management Team at their June 2010 meeting. Based on this discussion, the following goals and tasks were identified:

Goal I: The shared vision for the MIM is shared with a variety of stakeholders and audiences.

Task 1. Develop statement of shared vision for the Management Team.

Task 2. Develop communication plan to share information about the MIM across the Department, MIM districts, and other stakeholders.

Goal II: MIM is a vetted model for an integrated tiered system of student support (including all tools for implementation and evaluation).

Task 1. Implement master MIM evaluation plan to include repeated measures across all levels and to assure applicability for implementation as well as state-level decision-making.

Task 2. Develop MIM implementation assessment measure with criteria.

Task 3. Develop state/regional MIM implementation blueprint.

Goal III: Finalize MIM System of Support (including professional development, support materials, and coaching).

Task 1. Increase fluency of Implementation Research among Management Team.

Task 2. Design professional development experiences for teachers and administrators in MIM schools.

Task 3. Design professional development experiences and supporting materials for regional technical assistance providers and state level staff.

Task 4. Refine Implementation Facilitator role to define recommended knowledge/skills base and protocols for assisting schools.

Goal IV: Plan in place for scale-up within districts and to all districts statewide.

Task 1. Develop plan for Scaling Up.

Goal V: MIM is aligned with other school improvement initiatives (SW-PBS, PLC, HSTW, RTI, etc.).

Task 1. Develop a state-wide plan for aligning MIM with other school improvement initiatives.

Tasks are tied directly to the agenda and minutes of the Core MIM Management Team for monthly revisiting to reflect on attainment and modify as needed. Goal V was to align the MIM process with the CSIP (Comprehensive School Improvement Process) and MSIP (Missouri School Improvement Process), but this goal was placed on hold in December, 2010 due to restructuring of these processes.

All five goals met the expected level of attainment for this year, with two goals (III and IV) being rated +2 and +1, respectively.

During the reporting period, MIM Core Management team members (i.e., Special Education Coordinator, Director for Effective Practices, University of Missouri Kansas City external Research Consultant, University of Kansas external evaluators) met at least monthly to plan and organize MIM activities and trainings, discuss and address challenges, modify procedures and products, and disseminate information. During the reporting period, the MIM Management Team conducted one statewide training for all MIM building leadership teams (14 schools in the 2008-12 cohort and 11 schools in the 2010-12 cohort) at the MIM Summer Institute as well as four regional professional development meetings (2 in Fall, 2010 and 2 in Spring, 2011). At these meetings, MIM building and district level teams learned about implementing the MIM process and materials (i.e., progress monitoring, academic RTI, behavior incidents data collection, and logic model development) to further the MIM vision statement: Missouri schools will be responsive educational systems to meet the needs of all learners to guarantee the superior preparation and performance of every child in school and in life and Mission/Purpose: to develop and provide a sustainable framework for the implementation of responsive educational systems to ensure the success of all learners.

The Missouri Integrated Model Blueprint (available for download at www.mimschools.org) describes planned stages for implementation and scale-up within districts by adding additional schools. The fourteen 2008-12 MIM schools/districts have completed three years of the MIM involving initial and revisited self-study, annual action planning to address self-study findings, and development and refinement of the MIM essential features and tiered levels of support. In 2010, the MIM Management Team accepted applications in the form of a scaling up proposal to expand the MIM within each of the 14 pilot districts to more schools, in particular, high schools. Eleven new buildings were accepted into the process (including 3 middle schools and 5 high schools). As MIM schools were refining the cycle of self-study, action planning, and implementation to build an infrastructure of essential features and tiered levels of support, many MIM districts felt ready to begin the process in another building (at a same or

different grade level). Scaling-up is important to the pilot of MIM and will provide useful information for determining the effectiveness of the MIM, especially in regard to middle and high schools.

At the local and regional level, seven fully trained Implementation Facilitators (IFs) worked directly with the 10 RPDCs and the twenty-five pilot schools (14 veteran and 11 new schools) in fourteen districts to implement the MIM process. The 25 school and district teams met regularly with their Implementation Facilitators and RPDC teams to implement their MIM Action Plan and collect ongoing data for formative assessment. MIM pilot districts were supported in the completion of their Action Planning form in May and June, 2010, and since have been implementing the interventions specified in each plan. The Implementation Facilitators (IFs) report back to the Management Team on implementation through face-to-face meetings and an online password-protected website where all records and discussions are archived. Documents were uploaded on the MIM password-protected website, www.MIMschools.org/cop, and summarized by the external evaluators to provide the following information.

To assure basic fidelity to teaming and the MIM processes, a MIM Process Checklist containing 24 items was developed in 2010. All teams completed the Process Checklist and submitted it early spring, 2011. Results indicated that implementation at 80% or higher was evident in 13/24 items for the 2008-12 cohort and 7/24 items for the 2010-12 cohort. Implementation schools (2008-12 cohort) clearly have building leadership teams with recommended members that meet monthly, and include administration, defined meeting roles, team norms, structure, notes and materials. Additionally, these schools disseminate information widely, understand the MIM components and processes, administer the MIM Staff Survey annually, reflect on needs identified in the self-study process, and collaboratively develop and implement an action plan addressing key needs. Areas of low implementation were the following: District Leadership Team (DLT) meets quarterly at a minimum; Building Leadership Team (BLT) shares MIM information with community and families; and BLT and DLT partner and implement a plan for completing all MIM requirements and due dates. When results were discussed at a 2011 MIM Management Team meeting, state leadership speculated that for small participating schools there may be difficulty in distinguishing Building vs. District level participants (e.g., BLT and DLT are identical). For the newer 2010-12 cohort, middle and high schools have developed BLTs that meet monthly and include administration, with an identified process for reaching team decision. Meeting structure, and organizational systems are in place, MIM information is shared with other administrators district-wide and the MIM School Staff Survey is administered to all building staff. Similar to the veteran cohort, low implementation was evident in items related to the District Leadership Team and sharing information with community and families. Additional areas of low implementation for the 2010-13 cohort include: using data to drive decision-making, collaborative reflection on the self-study and action plan development and monitoring. It should be noted that these schools are in the first year of the MIM Process.

In February to March, 2011, all seven Implementation Facilitators (IFs) were interviewed for one hour by phone to obtain information about the successes and challenges in the original 14 MIM pilot schools and the 11 start-up schools. IFs provide technical assistance to MIM schools, guiding them through planning processes. They also act as liaisons between the state-level MIM Management Team, Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) staff, MIM district administrators and school staff. Interviews, which took place about three-fourths of the way through the school year, were recorded, transcribed, and coded based on successes and challenges for original MIM schools and newer start-up schools.

Successes

Successes for the original MIM schools (2008-12 cohort) are based on their second year of implementation. Notable progress among the original schools was made in several areas, including student achievement, data collection and analysis, leadership, integrating initiatives in behavior and academics, collaboration, and district support.

Successes in 2008-12 cohort MIM schools. IFs reported a wide range of successes as the 2008-12 cohort of 14 MIM schools progressed in implementing their action plans. Perhaps the most significant success was that implementation MIM schools have seen encouraging results in student achievement. In general, schools are seeing gradual improvement in student scores on standardized tests and progress monitoring tools (e.g.,

DIBELS). In addition, one school has emerged from school improvement status as a result of better test scores, and they attributed the increase to their involvement with MIM. Other schools have seen improved math scores.

IFs mentioned the general progress in many schools. For instance, one IF remarked on the range of activities that one school has carried out in support of school improvement: I've been very impressed with what I've seen, and listening to other people talk about how far they've come... They're really doing some good work with their kids and really focused on the data and they have behavior things going on, and they've got book studies going on with their faculty in this last intervention. It's an impressive group. Another IF noted that MIM gave them the resources to do what they were doing, to do it better and to make it more efficient. An IF noted that one school, whose progress had been slower in prior years, had done a complete 180, and was now energetically engaged in reform efforts on several fronts. Buy-in has improved, largely as a result of the persuasive impact of positive student data: When you have data and you start to show that you are making progress and how you're doing it, people start looking at it and say well, If you're successful with it, maybe I can be successful with it. You have a team of 5 teachers, and 4 of them are successful and one's a holdout, and all of a sudden, they come on board. Multiple IFs felt the improvements were sustainable to the extent that schools would continue with MIM processes even if MIM support were to be stopped: I think they could sustain and keep going. Finally, many schools have moved from an initial focus on reading (and behavior, in many cases) to look at their writing and math data and instruction.

The systematic, school-wide use of data for progress-monitoring and instructional decision-making was noted by the IFs as an area of improvement in all schools. According to one IF, the schools have really seen a lot of improvement with their teachers knowing how to use data. Being able to look at it and kind of dissect it in terms of what do we need to know and what don't we need to know. Data teams, which became a statewide focus in Missouri during the past year, were a key mechanism for schools' improved use of data. Universal screening and data management tools, such as AIMSWeb, DIBELS, and Acuity, were cited as particular data collection and analysis tools, and staff members from Missouri's RPDCs were cited as important professional development resources for improved data-based practices. Data processes have become an ingrained practice in most of the MIM schools.

Important developments have occurred in terms of leadership, as well, through the efforts of administrators and leadership team members. IFs noted that leadership has improved tremendously, which has led to more trusting relationships among all staff members. In one school, leadership team development was the primary success of the past year: according to the IF for that school, the leadership team is gelling and they're starting to work together and they're starting to share responsibilities and look more at [school improvement] from a global aspect. Effective leadership teams also provided stability for some schools going through a change in leadership at the administrative level. Principals, it was noted, were strong supporters of the MIM process. IFs also noted that leadership teams were becoming more independent and required less explicit direction from the IFs (e.g., for organizing and recoding meetings). In addition, leadership teams were doing a better job of coordinating and integrating additional building teams in place to support particular initiatives.

MIM schools continued to make successful strides toward full implementation of particular initiatives, including Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS), and Response to Intervention (RTI). Perhaps more importantly, schools have recognized the common features across different initiatives: Whether it's RTI, SW-PBS, or PLC, a lot of the terminology and the links and collaboration are all the same. So they recognize that there's a lot of commonalities amongst the 3 different types of them, just different structures. In addition, one school is doing a book study examining shared features among tiered models. Importantly, particular initiatives were emphasized less than the implementation of general processes, such as data teams or tiered levels of support. Moreover, IFs reported that several schools are improving in their efforts to integrate behavior and academic approaches. One IF said, They're truly looking at both sides of the triangle and looking at both academic and behavior, and another noted, I don't think there's any question that they understand that [behavior and academics] work together. Other remarks were similar: I think [they're] pretty integrated with how they look at data, how they plan instructional strategies, how they build their school improvement and They're seeing a correlation between behavior and learning and achievement.

IFs noted improved collaboration and professional development as a success in several implementation schools. One IF noted that they have come a long way as far as their collaborative culture. For some schools, collaboration extended beyond their immediate district. For example, one of the small, rural districts joined a consortium of similar districts organized by its regional RPDC for the purpose of sharing ideas and resources. Another school was collaborating with other districts through its Professional Learning Community. District staff could draw more ideas and problem-solving and discussions through the consortium to get back to their districts. Improvement in professional development has been driven by the RPDCs. IFs reported that RPDCs have provided tremendous support to the MIM schools. In addition, schools have recognized the benefits of professional development: They really, as a team and as a school, see the results of the professional development they're having and talk about the progress they've made as teams. But they've had intensive professional development throughout from literacy specialists and additional supports from the RPDC's PLC consultant.

Although, fewer schools explicitly targeted coaching and mentoring, parent and community involvement, and cultural responsiveness, in their action plans, those schools were seeing the results of their systematic efforts at improvement in those areas. One IF reported that a school is seeking mentoring and coaching outside its district: As we've completed the self-study, they've recognized a need that they have within their district for mentoring and coaching. And so they've sought mentoring and coaching outside the district through the consortium. For schools targeting parent and community involvement, the inclusion of a parent on the leadership team has been an important development. Another school reached out to the community by sending an article on their progress with MIM to the local newspaper. A third school has developed a parent resource library to increase parent involvement. Of schools focusing on cultural responsiveness, one is targeting achievement and disciplinary gaps between African-American male students and the rest of the school population by evaluating their teacher-student relationships, conducting book studies, attending conferences, and organizing lectures by experts on the topic. This work has led directly to significant improvements in disparate disciplinary referrals. Other schools are focusing more on disparities in student achievement among students in different socio-economic status. Strategies for addressing that concern included professional development on responsive instructional practices for students from low-income families and after-school programs to provide child-care for working parents.

In most instances, the 2008-12 cohort MIM schools have continued to experience positive district support. In some cases, district administrators have been impressed by the progress in MIM schools: MIM staff presented to the board Wednesday night about the MIM process. The board was really...taken aback with how much they've done. They're sort of like a beacon in that district right now. Notably, one district has adopted a MIM action-planning process and identified parent involvement as a district-wide initiative. This district team, which includes several parent and community members, has looked at the six national standards on family-community involvement and selected three of them to focus on.

Successes in MIM 2010-12 cohort schools. Eleven 2010-12 cohort schools consisting of middle and high schools formally began the MIM process in the past year. Most of these schools had completed or nearly completed their self-study at the time of the interviews; a few had begun their action planning. IFs said that their initial impressions of 2010-12 cohort school staff attitudes were positive (e.g., They're real eager, They've got a good leadership team) and optimistic (e.g., [they are] just going to continue to get better). Some schools are drawing on previous experience with tiered models of support (e.g., SW-PBS) as they work through their planning process. The formation of a leadership team is an important early process, and IFs noted good progress in that area. One IF summarized the attitudes and actions of a leadership team: They're just willing to get out there and look at themselves and go find and research ideas and come back to the table and have good honest discussions. One scale-up leadership team had developed protocols to share the information they had gathered on the MIM process with the entire faculty, and the IF reflected, I think that's really positive that they're taking that kind of lead as a team.

Many 2010-12 cohort schools were drawing on the expertise of the more experienced MIM school in their district by (a) emulating their planning documents and goals and (b) collaborating with their staff. One start-up school was already developing an action plan that certainly mirrors many of the activities that the elementary is doing. IFs were asked to speculate on the areas these schools were likely to target in their action planning

in coming months. Not surprisingly given the focus on data in the 2008-12 cohort pilot schools, many 2010-12 cohort schools are likely to target data-based decision-making and data teams in their planning. In preparation for the implementation phase, one school is doing monthly focus groups where they get together as teams and look at the data and plan. Another school has a leadership team that has already completed data team training; they will likely include that process in their action plan, according to their IF. Other probable goals for many schools included SW-PBS, PLCs, and RTI, and some of these initiatives had already been adopted as district initiatives prior to the scale-up schools involvement with MIM. Also like the original MIM pilot schools, 2010-12 cohort schools are utilizing RPDC staff as professional development resources from the very start of their MIM planning process. 2010-12 cohort schools are coordinating with RPDC staff to identify their professional development needs. In addition, one school is working with RPDC staff, their IF, and RTI consultants to try to merge MIM and RTI planning processes at this initial start-up phase.

Several developments had taken place with respect to collaboration between 2010-12 cohort schools and more experienced MIM schools. Several leadership teams in scale-up schools have met with the more experienced teams from the original schools to plan and share ideas. One district invited a leadership team member from the experienced school to a staff meeting to share experiences and advice based on multiple years of involvement with MIM. Another newer school has the benefit of leadership team members who have joint positions in the lower-grade MIM school, where they are on the leadership team. According to the IF, They've been a big help. Staff from some 2010-12 cohort schools have conducted observations in more experienced MIM schools in their districts, and a newer schools have sent staff to observe outside of their districts. Finally, one school had a new administrator with prior MIM experience in the pilot school in the same district. The IF for that school said, I feel that they have been able to move forward with this more readily because they have the background experience. Most districts have been supportive of MIM 2010-12 cohort middle and high schools, just as they've supported the original MIM schools. Some districts adopted a district-wide approach to MIM from the start, and their support has continued in the past year.

Challenges

The IFs identified a number of challenges that MIM schools experienced in the past year. Time and resources were concerns for MIM school staff, just as they are for staff in schools nearly everywhere. Schedules for both original and 2010-12 cohort MIM schools were upended by several strong winter storms which required school closures throughout the state. Likewise, 2008-12 and 2010-12 cohort schools alike were anxious about the effects of the ongoing state budget uncertainties and what impact they might have on funding for teaching and support positions, as well as for MIM-related programs and resources. In fact, IFs reported that many districts had lost positions in the previous year—often instructional coaching jobs—and they were going through a resource mapping process of sorts to identify how that coaching and mentoring support could be maintained, even without a dedicated position. Other schools have simply adjusted to not having any in-school coaching support. Lack of resources was noted as a particular concern among smaller MIM districts.

Challenges in original MIM schools. Turnover in staff and administration was a significant concern in a few of the 2008-12 cohort MIM schools. One original MIM school had undergone restructuring due to not making sufficient gains in adequate yearly progress (AYP). According to the school's IF, the extent of turnover across administration, leadership team members (We have two members from the original leadership team), and other staff, meant, We've had to kind of back up in a lot of areas and start over, kind of like retrain. So this year has been a little bit of a struggle. In other cases, schools were anticipating administrator turnover due to retirement in the upcoming year. One IF said that the leadership team will be important in supporting the transition to the new principal. RPDC staff turnover was a challenge in one school, where three different staff members had been their primary RPDC contact in the past three years.

Some of the 2008-12 cohort schools continued to experience lack of buy-in from all staff. For one school, according to the IF, the lack of buy-in was a result of having teams for separate initiatives (i.e., PLC, RTI, MIM) that didn't communicate sufficiently, and they're still separate entities. An IF characterized a buy-in problem in the following manner: I guess they're still thinking that the wheel's going to turn in education, as long as they don't get on it, they won't have to worry about it because, in time, it'll change and they won't have to do it. One school that has experienced

buy-in challenges throughout the MIM process has taken steps to systematically address this challenge in the previous year: They did a climate survey as part of looking at their relationships and their collaborative climate. These steps have helped the school identify problems with trusting relationships that they continue to build. Another school had solved buy-in problems from previous years: the IF attributed the change to the efforts of the MIM leadership team in being the leaders and the cheerleaders and getting people on the same page.

Although schools had important successes with their development of processes for data-based decision-making and collaboration, IFs reported challenges in these areas, as well. For instance, an IF noted that one school was lacking intensive professional development...with their data teams. According to another IF, one school was experiencing challenges in coming to a consensus on what particular measures to use for literacy; this concern was attributed to the reading wars gone postal. This school is currently doing more professional development on the benefits of particular measures. Another school recently decided to use AIMSWeb, and they have had some difficulties collecting the proper response and data. In terms of collaboration, an IF said one school's work in this area is best characterized as a contrived collaboration, rather than a true trusting collaborative culture.

Other schools were navigating challenges related to too many initiatives and not enough district support. Implementing multiple, simultaneous initiatives sometimes led to feelings that they have taken so much on their plate that is about full. One IF noted that a school was struggling to prioritize [and] not work on everything at once, and another IF said, I think they probably have way, way too many things going on and way too many things they're trying to tackle. At least one school felt pressure from their district administration to implement multiple initiatives at once. Finally, one IF said, The district hasn't had a commitment...to participate in data team training

Challenges in MIM 2010-12 cohort schools. A few challenges were unique to MIM 2010-12 cohort schools. Like the original schools when they started with the MIM process, some newer schools were struggling to understand MIM conceptually: They don't really understand what they're doing yet, as far as the whole MIM process and what that's all about. I think as we get further into it, it'll become clearer. In other cases, schools wanted to move directly to problem-solving without first taking stock of the problems in their building by scrutinizing the data sources that cause them to identify them as challenges in the first place. Some schools felt the time lines for completing MIM planning documents were too short, especially given the inclement weather during the winter. IFs for at least two 2010-12 cohort schools identified challenges with leadership: principals that did not appear to be completely committed to the process. In addition, some staff thought MIM would dictate particular professional development activities without realizing that such activities would depend on the results of the self-study and action plan. Finally, some schools thought the amount of paperwork was excessive.

Some 2010-12 cohort schools had challenges related to parent involvement and culturally responsive practices. For instance, some schools had not yet included a parent and/or community member on their leadership teams. One IF noted that family and community involvement has been [the] biggest challenge in one scale-up school, and continued, I think all of our schools have struggled to find ways to get that. Some 2010-12 cohort schools interpreted culturally responsiveness as defining only by racial/ethnic differences; an IF noted that socio-economic differences are important considerations, as well. According to one IF, a school had not yet recognized a problem with cultural responsiveness (i.e., office and special education referral rates are disproportionate for African-American students) but said, When we start working on the action plan, some of those things might come out.

IFs reported a few potential challenges unique to high schools. For example, the research base for, and development of, key components in several school-wide initiatives are lacking at the secondary level. Progress monitoring tools validated for secondary students, for example, are difficult to find; so too are effective high school RTI models. On a related note, secondary teachers have less experience with progress monitoring practices than their peers in lower grades. In addition, one IF noted that secondary teachers tend to be just a little bit more set in their ways and have a lot stronger sense of independence; these may discourage reform efforts and inhibit collaboration. High school organizational structures also

constitute potential challenges, since content area departments may be reluctant to collaborate. In summary, The biggest challenge is changing the culture of the high school teachers.

1.1b In 2010-11, Missouri worked with all ten of the RPDCs to better serve the needs in the state. Staff in these regional centers provides personnel development to LEAs statewide, as well as MIM pilot districts. RPDCs are seen as key partners in the implementation of the MIM. In July, 2010, teams from nine of the ten RPDCs attended the MIM Summer Institute and Directors and Assistant Directors met with MIM Management Team members to discuss: (a) the ongoing role of the RPCD in the MIM process, (b) restructuring due to statewide changes in funding and staffing, (c) assisting MIM teams with data organization, and (d) collaboration with Implementation Facilitators (IFs). The input of the RPDC representatives was recorded and summarized for the consideration and benefit of the MIM Management Team. Furthermore, 29 RPDC staff attended the 2½ day training.

1. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Goal 1: To enhance the capacity of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and RPDCs to support the development, implementation and evaluation of a targeted system of professional development at the regional, district, and school levels in an effort to improve educational achievement and outcomes for children and youth with disabilities

Objective 1.2 To improve professional development provided by the Department and the RPDC consultants through increased collaboration.

1.2a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of RPDC consultants and Department staff who report satisfaction regarding collaboration in development and implementation of MIM professional development efforts.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		86/139	61.9

1.2b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of RPDC consultants and Department staff who report increased knowledge regarding research-based 3-tiered models in education. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #1.1]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		120/165	72.7

1.2c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of RPDC consultants and Department staff who report satisfaction regarding technical assistance with professional development.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		69/155	44.5

1.2.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--	--

Percent of school personnel involved in the MIM who report satisfaction with regard to regional and state support.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		105/110	95.4

1.2.e Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of professional development/training activities that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #2.1]	PROG	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		13/13	100.0

1.2.f Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #2.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		13/13	100.0

1.2a-1.2c In order to provide a comprehensive professional development framework, one goal of the MIM is to show increases among RPDC consultants and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education staff in the following areas: (a) satisfaction regarding collaboration, (b) level of knowledge of multi-tiered models, and (c) satisfaction with technical assistance from the DESE. To evaluate these changes, two online surveys were developed to assess levels of collaboration, knowledge, and satisfaction. In 2009-10, these surveys were vetted by members of the MIM Management Team, in addition to leadership from the Department and two RPDCs. Online surveys were administered via Survey Monkey in March 2011 to all RPDC and Department staff, providing a comparison to last year's baseline. The response rate increased from past reporting periods to 106/146 RPDC staff (73%) and 73/197 Department staff (37%). Results from 106 RPDC staff (increased from 76 in 09-10) and 73 Department staff (increased from 45 in 09-10) were analyzed to reveal critical information about the progress of the MIM. It should be noted that this online survey was sent to all RPDC and Department staff, not just those in attendance at a MIM event (2009 APR).

For Indicator 1.2a, 86 RPDC and Department staff out of 139 respondents agreed (rated 3 or higher on 5 point scale) that they were satisfied with the collaboration in developing and implementing the MIM. More specifically, 56/77 (73%) RPDC staff and 30/62(48%) Department staff report that they were satisfied with the collaboration in developing and implementing the MIM. For indicator 1.2b, 120 RPDC and Department staff out of 165 respondents agreed (rated 3 or higher on 5 point scale) that over the past two years, their knowledge of research-based, tiered models of student support had increased. More specifically, 89/98 (91%) RPDC staff and 31/70 (44%) Department staff report that their knowledge of research-based, tiered models of student support had increased. For indicator 1.2c, 69 RPDC and Department staff out of 155 respondents agreed (rated 3 or higher on 5 point scale) that they were satisfied with the technical assistance available in Missouri to enhance their professional development activities. More specifically, 44/88 (50%) RPDC staff and 25/67 (37%) Department staff report that they were satisfied with the technical assistance available in Missouri to enhance their professional development activities.

To further inform the MIM Management Team about changes in the level of collaboration, the online survey included a level of collaboration scale (Frey, Loheier, Lee, Tollefson, and Johanning, 2004). The five-point scale provides detailed definitions of all five levels of collaboration (i.e.,

networking, cooperation, coordination, coalition and collaboration) and asked respondents to rate their personal level of interaction with various grant partners (i.e., Office of Quality Schools, Office of Special Education, Office of Early and Extended Learning, Office of Adult Learning, Office of Educator Quality, Office of College and Career Readiness, Office of Data System Management, RPDCs, MIM Schools, MIM Districts, Parent Centers, Representatives of Higher Education). Responses were analyzed to see changes in the level of collaboration during the last year in comparison to earlier MIM years, ranging from the lowest level networking to cooperation to coordination to coalition to collaboration being the highest form of working together.

Results from the RPDC survey indicated that RPDC consultants maintained their level of collaboration with the Department at the same level as the prior reporting period, halfway between Cooperation (i.e., characterized by providing information to each other, somewhat defined roles, independent decision making and formal communication) and Coordination (i.e., characterized by sharing information and resources, defined roles, frequent communication and some shared decision-making). Furthermore, RPDCs saw an increase in collaboration with other RPDCs in the past two years, growing from Coalition to high Coalition (i.e., characterized by shared ideas, shared resources, frequent prioritized communication and shared decision-making) and emerging Coordination (3.28 mean on 5 point scale). RPDCs reported maintaining their level of collaboration with Parent Centers (e.g., MPACT) at the Networking level (i.e., characterized by awareness of the organization, loosely defined roles, little communication) and representatives of higher education at the Cooperation level (mean 1.95). Furthermore, RPDC staff report a general understanding of the MIM (3.13 mean on 5 point scale), an increase of knowledge of three-tiered models (3.96 mean on 5 point scale), increased collaboration with the Department offices (2.82 mean on 5 point scale), and an understanding of where to get MIM information when needed (3.85 mean on 5 point scale).

Results from the Department survey indicated that staff largely have maintained or decreased level of collaboration with other internal and external entities. Department staff rated their level of collaboration with RPDCs as decreasing from Coordination (i.e., characterized by sharing information and resources, defined roles, frequent communication and some shared decision-making) to Cooperation (1.61 on 5 point scale). Department staff rated their level of collaboration with MIM Schools/Districts, Parent Centers and Representatives of Higher Education as staying consistently at the Networking level (i.e., characterized by awareness of the organization, loosely defined roles, little communication). Finally, Department staff reported decreased collaboration internally with other offices at the Department, staying just under the Cooperation level (1.76 on 5 point scale) (i.e., characterized by providing information to each other, somewhat defined roles, independent decision making and formal communication) but decreasing from the last reporting period. Scores between offices ranged from 0.95 to 2.4. Additionally, Department staff reported a limited understanding of the MIM (1.96 on 5 point scale, down from 2.76 in 2010), a somewhat increased knowledge of three-tiered models over the past year (2.44 on 5 point scale), decreased collaboration within the Department offices over the past year (1.76 on 5 point scale), and decreased collaboration between the Department and RPDCs over the past year (1.61 on 5 point scale, down from 3.52 in 2010). The MIM Management Team briefly discussed the decrease in reported collaboration and reflected that it might be due to a department-wide reorganization in 2010. At that time, the Department completely reorganized from Divisions to Offices and many staff shifted into new roles, responsibilities and even physical locations.

1.2d At the MIM Spring Meetings in February, 2011, members of MIM Building Leadership Teams were surveyed to rate their satisfaction with the support provided by the RPDC and DESE on a 5-point likert scale from (1) *strongly disagree* and (5) *strongly agree*. Overall MIM Building Leadership Team members are highly satisfied with the professional development and technical assistance that they receive from the RPDCs ($M = 4.69$) and satisfied with the support they receive from the DESE ($M = 3.96$). It should be noted that this sample is limited to participants of the MIM Spring Meetings ($n=55$).

1.2e In regard to Program Performance Measure #2.1, there were a total of 13 SPDG-supported professional development/training activities and all 13 offered information on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices. SPDG-funded professional development included a variety of events: 2 MIM Fall Regional Meetings, 2 MIM Spring Regional Meetings, MIM Summer Institute, Missouri Community Transition Team Trainings and Sustainability Follow-up Training, Missouri Transition Institute, Mo SW-PBS Summer Institute, Mo SW-PBS Secondary Interventions. Some of the topics covered at these events included: MIM Process and Lessons Learned; State-wide Data Picture; Participating School Experiences; Beginning and Intermediate Data Processes; Stretching Resources; Building a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Through Data, Practices and Systems; Focus on Implementing Tiered Levels of Math; Creating Collaborative Environments; Scaling Up; Focus on Implementing Tiered Levels of Behavior Support; Parent & Community Involvement; Data Overload/Data Inventory; Focus on Implementing Tiered Levels of Literacy; Strengthening the Universal Level; and Response to Intervention.

At the 2011 MIM Spring Regional Meetings, participants were asked to rate their Pre and Post level of knowledge on a five point scale. Participants who attended Beginning Data Processes reported significantly increased knowledge on the following indicators: (a) I feel that I understand both cause and effect data and the importance of using both to monitor effective teaching, learning, and leadership; (b) I feel that I understand a model of continuous school improvement based upon effective use of data; (c) and I feel that I understand the readiness work required to effectively implement data teams and a model for using formative assessment data to drive instructional decisions. Participants who attended the Intermediate Data Processes session reported significantly increased knowledge on the following indicators: (a) I feel that I understand the importance of measuring implementation; (b) I feel that I understand specific ways to measure implementation of Data Management and Reporting; and (c) I feel that I understand how to focus efforts related to data processes.

1.2f In regard to Program Performance Measure #2.2, there were a total of 13 SPDG-supported professional development/training activities and all 13 are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices. All 13 events are a part of a series of trainings (i.e., no one-time events) with a progression of intensity and depth of information. Furthermore, six Implementation Facilitators attended all events, which often included team processing time with the IFs in order to connect content with immediate, short-term and long-term actions and activities.

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Goal 2: To enhance the capacity of the LEA to improve educational achievement and outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 2.1: To improve knowledge and behavior of LEA staff.

2.1a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of teachers (general and special educators) in identified schools who participated in research-based professional development. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #1.1]	PROG	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			50/100		50.0		494/631

2.1b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of teachers (general and special educators) in identified schools who participated in on-going and	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

comprehensive professional development in evidence-based instruction/behavioral practices. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #2.2]			1/1	100.0		457/631	72.4
---	--	--	-----	-------	--	---------	------

2.1c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of school instructional personnel (general and special educators) involved in the MIM who report high levels of collaboration within identified schools.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		366/430	85.1

2.1d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of school instructional personnel (general and special educators) involved in the MIM who report the use of data-driven decision making; [correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2].	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		341/412	82.8

2.1e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of school instructional personnel (general and special educators) involved in the MIM who report the use of research-based models of instruction and intervention. [aligned with Program Performance Measure #2]; [correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROG	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		329/421	78.1

2.1f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of school instructional personnel (general and special educators) within MIM identified schools who report job satisfaction.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		275/354	77.7

2.1a-2.1b During the reporting period, school personnel signed up for numerous professional development trainings and workshops through *My Learning Plan*, software that tracks professional development by the user. This software enables the MIM Management Team to access professional development participation rates by MIM schools. Additionally, the 25 participating schools received an online survey in spring, 2011 to provide information about in-service training about topics such as research-based instruction and progress monitoring as part of the MIM process. Twenty-one of the 25 schools completed the online survey. During the reporting period, 494 of the 631 instructional staff (i.e., general and special educators) within the MIM schools participated in research-based professional development. This data represents an increase from last year's data, indicating that more school staff participated in evidence-based professional development. Additionally, 72.4% (457/631) of the total number of general and special educators within specific MIM schools participated in professional development opportunities which were on-going, comprehensive, and

focused on evidence-based instruction/behavioral practices. The number 631 represents total general and special educators from the 2009-10 school year working in the 21/25 MIM pilot schools, as reported via the online survey and through School Profile (staff count).

2.1 c-f To gain a comprehensive view of the implementation of the MIM at the school level, staff members in each MIM school were asked to complete the *MIM School Staff Survey* by March, 2011. MIM Building Leadership Teams disseminated a link to the MIM School Staff Survey to each of their staff members. This confidential, online survey asked staff members to rate their current level of implementation on indicators of each of the eleven MIM Essential Features. The 5-point Likert scale asked staff to score the indicators as (1) *this statement is not at all true of me now* to (5) *this statement is very true of me now*. Ratings of 4 and 5 were combined for data reporting. All 25 Schools: During the reporting period, a total of 833 staff members from both the 14 2008-12 cohort schools and the 11 2010-12 cohort schools completed the survey. The responses represent a total of 660 teachers, 70 other certified staff, 51 non-certified staff, and 41 administrators. The data is further broken down into 2008-12 cohort schools and 2010-12 cohort schools. 2008-12 Cohort: The total number of responses for the 2008-12 cohort schools was 483, which represented a total of 380 teachers, 39 other certified staff, 32 non-certified staff and 26 administrators. 2010-12 Cohort: The total responses for 2010-12 cohort schools was 350, which represented a total of 280 teachers, 31 other certified staff, 19 non-certified staff and 15 administrators. Data for 2008-12 Cohort and 2010-12 Cohort is reported separately.

2008-2012 Cohort:

Statements on the MIM School Staff Survey related to professional development and ongoing coaching included:

I participate in professional development where I learn how to monitor students' progress & use progress monitoring data. Out of 357 teachers who responded, 253 (71%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (64%).

I participate in professional development where I learn ways to improve my instructional practices. Out of 352 teachers who responded, 301 (86%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (82%).

I receive coaching/mentoring to implement evidence-based instructional practices. Out of 355 teachers who responded, 239 (67%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (62%).

I receive coaching/mentoring to help me implement tiered levels of academic & behavior support. Out of 353 teachers who responded, 217 (61%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (48%).

2.1c To identify the level of collaboration, school staff rated the statement, *I collaborate with my colleagues on a regular basis*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 85% of MIM school staff collaborates at high levels. This represents an increase from last year (83%). In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to collaboration:

I am involved in action planning tiered supports with the other staff & administrators at my school. Out of 433 school staff who responded, 262 (60%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (51%).

When I am concerned about a student's academic success, I collaborate with a team to identify intervention. Out of 413 school staff who responded, 324 (78%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (73%).

When I am concerned about a student's behavior success, I collaborate with a team to identify intervention. Out of 418 school staff who responded, 307 (73%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (69%).

2.1d To identify the level of data-driven decision making, school staff rated the statement, *I adapt the environment, curriculum, & instruction based on each student's academic & behavior data*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 82.8% of MIM school staff report using data to

make adaptations for students. This represents an increase from last year (79%). In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to data-driven decision making:

I use assessment data at least three times a year to monitor students' progress. Out of 414 school staff who responded, 329 (79%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents a slight decrease from last year (82%).

I am involved in meetings where data results are discussed & problem solving occurs. Out of 436 school staff who responded, 330 (76%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (68%).

I regularly see students move between tiers of support as their academic needs change. Out of 432 school staff who responded, 236 (55%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents slight decrease from last year (58%).

I regularly see students move between tiers of support as their behavior needs change. Out of 428 school staff who responded, 171 (40%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents slight decrease from last year (50%).

2.1e To identify the use of research-based models of instruction, school staff rated the statement, *I am able to meet the students' diverse needs*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 78.1% of MIM school staff report that they meet the needs of diverse students. This represents an increase from last year (68%). In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to data-driven decision making:

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 1 (universal). Out of 438 school staff who responded, 322 (74%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (65%).

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 2 (small group). Out of 439 school staff who responded, 283 (64%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents a decrease from last year (65%).

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 3 (intensive). Out of 436 school staff who responded, 237 (54%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (46%).

I have the technology & resources that I need to provide effective instruction. Out of 422 school staff who responded, 300 (71%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (62%).

I consider my students' background when I plan lessons. Out of 422 school staff who responded, 390 (92%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (82%).

I think that the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) is improving education for students in my school. Out of 422 school staff who responded, 310 (73%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5. This represents an increase from last year (51%).

2.1f In order to evaluate job satisfaction in MIM schools, teachers rated the statement: *I think my school is a good place to work*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 77.7% of teachers in MIM schools report being highly satisfied with their work environment. This represents an increase from last year (74%). An additional 45 teachers (13%) rated this statement a 3, described as 'somewhat true of me now.'

2010-2012 Cohort:

Since the 11 schools in the 2010-12 Cohort began the MIM process during this reporting period, all data is considered to be at a baseline level for these schools. Statements on the MIM School Staff Survey related to professional development and ongoing coaching included:

I participate in professional development where I learn how to monitor students' progress & use progress monitoring data. Out of 265 teachers who responded, 140 (53%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I participate in professional development where I learn ways to improve my instructional practices. Out of 267 teachers who responded, 216 (81%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I receive coaching/mentoring to implement evidence-based instructional practices. Out of 262 teachers who responded, 106 (40%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I receive coaching/mentoring to help me implement tiered levels of academic & behavior support. Out of 106 teachers who responded, 262 (40%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

2.1c To identify the level of collaboration, school staff rated the statement, *I collaborate with my colleagues on a regular basis*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 82% of MIM school staff collaborates at high levels. In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to collaboration:

I am involved in action planning tiered supports with the other staff & administrators at my school. Out of 306 school staff who responded, 119 (39%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

When I am concerned about a student's academic success, I collaborate with a team to identify intervention. Out of 315 school staff who responded, 230 (73%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5

When I am concerned about a student's behavior success, I collaborate with a team to identify intervention. Out of 317 school staff who responded, 221 (70%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

2.1d To identify the level of data-driven decision making, school staff rated the statement, *I adapt the environment, curriculum, & instruction based on each student's academic & behavior data*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 75% of MIM school staff report using data to make adaptations for students. In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to data-driven decision making:

I use assessment data at least three times a year to monitor students' progress. Out of 309 school staff who responded, 226 (73%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I am involved in meetings where data results are discussed & problem solving occurs. Out of 321 school staff who responded, 208 (65%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I regularly see students move between tiers of support as their academic needs change. Out of 301 school staff who responded, 137 (46%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I regularly see students move between tiers of support as their behavior needs change. Out of 298 school staff who responded, 121 (41%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

2.1e To identify the use of research-based models of instruction, school staff rated the statement, *I am able to meet the students' diverse needs*, on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that 63% of MIM school staff report that they meet the needs of diverse students. In addition, school staff rated the following statements related to data-driven decision making:

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 1 (universal). Out of 316 school staff who responded, 216 (68%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 2 (small group). Out of 316 school staff who responded, 167 (53%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I think my school does a good job of addressing the academic & behavior needs of students at tier 3 (intensive). Out of 315 school staff who responded, 135 (43%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I have the technology & resources that I need to provide effective instruction. Out of 315 school staff who responded, 186 (59%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I consider my students' background when I teach and/or interact with students. Out of 309 school staff who responded, 251 (81%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

I think that the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) is improving education for students in my school. Out of 243 school staff who responded, 139 (57%) rated this statement as a 4 or 5.

2.1f In order to evaluate job satisfaction in MIM schools, teachers were asked to rate the statement *I think my school is a good place to work* on the MIM School Staff Survey. The results show that for the 11 schools in the 2010-12 cohort, 84% of teachers reported being highly satisfied with their work environment.

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Goal 2: To enhance the capacity of the LEA to improve educational achievement and outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 2.2: To improve student academic achievement, behavior, and transition education.

2.2a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities <i>in identified schools</i> who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in communication arts during the 2009-10 school year (note: mean of 14 schools' means of state reading assessments in grades 3-8, 11). (correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			67.4/100		67.4		20.4/100

2.2b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities <i>in identified schools</i> who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in mathematics during the 2009-10 school year. (note: mean of 14 districts' means of state math assessments in grades 3-8, 11). (correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2)	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			63.3/100		63.3		26.8/100

2.2c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities within <i>identified districts</i> during the 2009-10 school year who are inside regular class at least 80% of the day. [correlated with SPP Indicator 5; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			59/100		59.0		68.1/100

2.2d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities <i>in identified districts</i>		Target			Actual Performance Data		

during the 2009-10 school year who are suspended or expelled. [correlated with SPP Indicator 4; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			20/100	20.0		34.8/100	34.8

2.2e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students <i>in identified schools</i> during the 2009-10 school year with six or more office discipline referral. [correlated with SPP Indicator 4; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			5/100	5.0		580/7876	7.4

2.2f. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students <i>in identified districts</i> during the 2008-09 school year who report engagement in classroom and school activities. [correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			75/100	75.0		2445/3697	66.1

2.2g. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of youth aged 16 and above in Missouri with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals during the 2009-10 school year. [correlated with SPP Indicator 13; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		91.3/100	91.3

2.2h. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of youth aged 16 and above in <i>identified districts</i> with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals during the 2009-10 school year. [correlated with SPP Indicator 13; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1/1	100.0		100/100	100.0

2.2i. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Dropout rate of students with disabilities <i>in identified districts</i> during the 2009-10 school year. [correlated with SPP Indicator 2; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			4.9/100	4.9		2.3/100	2.3

2.2j. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Graduation rate of students with disabilities <i>in identified districts</i> during 2009-10 school year. [correlated with SPP Indicator 1; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			74.5/100	74.5		89.4/100	89.4

2.2k. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Attendance rate of students <i>in identified districts</i> during 2009-10 school year (note: mean of 14 districts attendance rates). [correlated with SPP Indicator 3; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			95/100	95.0		94.7/100	94.7

2.2a The percentage of students with disabilities *in the identified schools* who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in communication arts (20.4%) is lower than the state average 2009-10 (26.1%), but has consistently increased from 2008-09 (16.1%), 2007-08 (14.3%) and 2006-07 (14.6%). During the 2009-10 school year, each MIM school identified a progress monitoring measure for literacy and has begun assessing all students a minimum of three times per year. Furthermore, MIM schools are reporting this data to the MIM Management Team for evaluation purposes and to support the development of the MIM. For the eleven schools beginning the MIM in 2010-11, the percentage of students with disabilities who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in communication arts was 19.1% in 2009-10.

2.2b The percentage of students with disabilities *in the identified schools* who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in math (26.8%) is below the 2009-10 state average (29.2%), but has consistently increased from 2008-09 (18.5%), 2007-08 (17.3%) and 2006-2007 (17.9%). For the eleven schools beginning the MIM in 2010-11, the percentage of students with disabilities who demonstrate proficiency or better on state assessments in math was 23.9% in 2009-10.

2.2c The percentage of students with disabilities *in the identified districts* who are inside the regular class at least 80% of the day (68.1%) is greater than the 2009-10 state average (59.8%). Additionally, the districts increased performance on this indicator from 2008-09 (67%), 2007-08 (66.4%) and 2006-07 (64.0%) with respect to children with IEPs inside the regular class at least 80% or more of the day.

2.2d The percentage of students with disabilities *in identified districts* during the 2009-10 school year who are suspended or expelled is 34.8%. This number represents the average percentage of students with an IEP receiving either OSS or ISS from each of the 14 pilot districts. The MIM number is higher than the 2009-10 state average of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled, which is 30.60% and represents an increase from 2009-10 (32.2%).

2.2e Twenty-two of the 25 MIM pilot schools reported office referral data through the online MIM School Profile data-collection system. An average of 7.4% of students within each MIM school received six or more office discipline referrals (580/7876). This represents a decrease from 2008-09 (8.5%) of students receiving six or more discipline referrals.

2.2f The Department collects parent, student, and community engagement information through a survey process given to schools during their Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) cycle. This Advance Questionnaire evaluates perceptions of students, parents, and the school faculty on a number of indicators. These surveys were administered in 13 of the 14 MIM school districts during the 2008-2009 school year. The questions on the Student Advance Questionnaire were analyzed to identify the percentage of students with disabilities *in identified schools* who report engagement in classroom and school activities. These questions were:

1. I learn a lot in this school. Agree or Strongly Agree: 75%
2. If I am having trouble learning something, my teacher helps me understand. Agree or Strongly Agree: 66%
3. I like going to this school. Agree or Strongly Agree: 56%

Of the 3679 elementary and middle school students with and without disabilities in 13 MIM pilot schools, an average of 2445 students (66.1%) agreed or strongly agreed with the above three statements.

The information received from the administration of the Advance Questionnaire to students and families in 08-09 represents baseline data for the purposes of this project, and will be collected again for analysis of change in year five of the MIM.

2.2g While Missouri did not meet the target of 100% for Indicator 13, 2009-10 data (91.3%) indicates a steady increase from 2008-09 data (88.1%), 82.5% (2007-08), 73.2% (2006-07) and 44.8% (2005-06). The statewide data represents 1/5 of Missouri districts that completed the self-assessment through the MSIP during the 2009-10 school year. During the 2009-10 school year, the Department continued to help teachers improve their ability to write IEPs that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. This training and technical assistance included: four days of statewide training through a Summer Institute and Winter Training; the development of an online open-access training module; continued updates to the online Missouri Transition Community of Practice (www.MissouriTransition.org) through updated resources and three Ask the Expert events, formation and support of Community Transition Teams; training to Regional Professional Development Center consultants who specialize in transition planning; implementation of the Transition Outcomes Project; and identification of districts with successful models of transition planning.

2.2h Data for Indicator 13 are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state. Additional districts conduct IEP reviews by volunteering to participate in the Missouri Transition Outcomes Project. The reported 100% compliance in Indicator 13 represents data from 3 of the 14 pilot districts.

2.2i The 2009-10 dropout rate of students with disabilities *in the identified districts* (2.3%) continually decreased from 2008-09 (3.6%) and 2007-08 (8.0%). The dropout rate in MIM districts is also now lower than the 2008-09 state average (4.7%).

2.2j The 2009-10 graduation rate for students with disabilities in MIM districts (89.4) shows a continued increase from 2008-09 (75.3%), 2007-08 (73.4%) and 2006-07 (72.8%). The graduation rate for students with disabilities in MIM districts is also now higher than the 2009-10 state average (78.3%).

2.2k The 2009-10 attendance rate of students *in the identified districts* (94.7) has increased slightly since 2008-09 (94.7%) and is now above the state average (94.2%).

2. Project Objective [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Goal 2: To enhance the capacity of the LEA to improve educational achievement and outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 2.3: To assist LEA personnel in improving collaboration, information-sharing, and satisfaction of parents and families.

2.3a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of parents with a student with a disability in identified schools who report that school facilitated parental involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [correlated with SPP Indicator 8; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			77.5/100	77.5		195/257	

2.3b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of parents with a student with a disability in identified schools who report satisfaction with information-sharing about educational services. [correlated with SPP Indicator 8; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			77.5 /100	77.5		184/255	

2.3c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percent of parents with a student with a disability in identified schools who report satisfaction with the education provided for their student with a disability. [correlated with SPP Indicator 8; Program Performance Measure 1.2]	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			77.5/100	77.5		176/256	

2.3a The information received from the administration of the Advance Questionnaire to students and families in 08-09 represents baseline data for the purposes of this project, and will be collected again for analysis of change in year five of the MIM. The Department collects parent, student, and community engagement information through a survey process given to schools during their Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) cycle. This Advance Questionnaire evaluates perceptions of students, parents, and the school faculty on a number of indicators. In 2008-09, of the 257 parents of students with disabilities in 13 of the 14 MIM schools in the 2008-12 Cohort, 195 agreed or strongly agreed with the following statement, The school encourages parents to be involved. This percentage (75.9%) was similar to the percentage of parents of students without disabilities in 2008-09 (76.9%).

2.3b The information received from the administration of the Advance Questionnaire to students and families in 08-09 represents baseline data for the purposes of this project, and will be collected again for analysis of change in year five of the MIM. The Parent Advance Questionnaire was used

to identify the percent of parents of a student with a disability in identified schools who report satisfaction with information-sharing about educational services. Of the 255 parents of students with disabilities, representing 13 of the 14 MIM schools in the 2008-12 Cohort, 184 agreed or strongly agreed to the following statement, I receive information about the educational services available to my child at school. This percentage (72.2%) was higher than the percentage of parents of students without disabilities in 2008-09 (68.5%).

2.3c The information received from the administration of the Advance Questionnaire to students and families in 08-09 represents baseline data for the purposes of this project, and will be collected again for analysis of change in year five of the MIM. Three questions from the Parent Advance Questionnaire were analyzed to identify the satisfaction with the level of involvement in schools by parents of students with disabilities. These questions were:

1. The way they teach at this school works well for my child.
2. My child is given a fair chance to succeed at school.
3. Effective assistance is provided to children having difficulty in school.

Of the 256 parents of students with disabilities, representing 13 of the 14 MIM schools in the 2008-12 Cohort, an average of 176 agreed or strongly agreed with these statements. This percentage (68.8%) is slightly lower than the percentage of parents of students without disabilities in 2008-09 (70.9%).

3. Program Performance Measures

3a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Program Performance Measure #1.2: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan. (SPP)	PROG	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6/6	100%		6/6	100%

3b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Program Performance Measure #1.1, 2.1, and 2.2 are <i>referred to above</i> in the objectives and project performance measures. Program Performance Measure #3.1 and 4.1 are not applicable to the goals of the Missouri SPDG at this time.	PROG	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3a. The 2007-2012 Missouri SPDG Program partners with six projects to support activities related to the development and implementation of the MIM: (a) the MIM (<http://www.mimschools.org>), (b) the Transition Coalition (<http://www.transitioncoalition.org>), (c) the University of Missouri-Columbia (MU) Center for Positive Behavior Support project, (d) the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) project (<http://www.ptimpact.com/>), (e) the KU-Missouri SPDG evaluation project, and (f) the University of Missouri Kansas City Institute for Human Development. All six projects implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in Missouri's State

Performance Plan. Specifically, the projects are designed to promote improvement on State Performance Plan Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 through ongoing professional development that is high-quality and research-based.

3b. Program Performance Measure #3.1 (Teacher Retention) & #4.1 (Scale-up Scientific of Evidence-based Practices) are not applicable to the goals of the Missouri SPDG at this time.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _H323A070017_

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

SPDG funds were expended at the expected rate during the past budget period for most activities. There were no significant changes to the budget resulting from modification of project activities nor were there changes to the budget that affected our ability to achieve approved project activities and/or project objectives.

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Current partners on grant.

The current partners on this grant are:

- Missouri Parents Act (MPACT), the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)
- The University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition
- The University of Missouri (MU) Center for Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MU SW-PBS)
- The University of Kansas (KU) Research Collaboration (Project Evaluators)
- The University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) Institute for Human Development

None of the above partners changed during the present budget period and no change is anticipated for this next period.

At this time we do not anticipate any changes to the grant's activities for the coming year.

At this time we are not requesting changes to key personnel as indicated on block 4 of the GAN.