Mississippi Department of Education

IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Procedures

Revised July 2024

Overview of General Supervision

Each state is required to have a general supervision system that monitors implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The state's general supervision system highlights the state's accountability for meeting programmatic requirements, to monitor IDEA implementation by local education agencies (LEAs), and to ultimately improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. The eight components of general supervision are as follows: state performance plan; policies, procedures, and effective implementation; integrated monitoring activities; fiscal management; data on processes and results; improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions; effective dispute resolution; and targeted technical assistance and professional development. To be most effective, the eight components of a general supervision system are integrated whereby the components connect and interact with, articulate, and inform each other.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) is authorized, under §37-23-5 of the Mississippi Code 1972, to "foster, inspect, approve, and administer a program of education for exceptional children." It is the responsibility of the MDE Office of Special Education (OSE) to ensure implementation of federal mandates and state laws and regulations regarding the provision of programs, services, and protections to all Mississippi children and youth with disabilities.[1] MDE OSE is responsible for monitoring the programmatic and financial activities of its LEAs. Administrative responsibilities include the general supervision requirements of the IDEA, as well as program and fiscal monitoring and support for LEAs as required by federal and state statutes and regulations. These policies and procedures ensure the oversight, evaluation, and monitoring of each Mississippi LEA and any other subrecipient.

IDEA requires the primary focus of monitoring to be on 1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, and 2) ensuring states and LEAs meet the IDEA program requirements. With a heightened focus on accountability and effectiveness for students with disabilities, the MDE OSE implements a process for Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) to support LEA improvement efforts that are designed to increase the educational results and functional outcomes of Mississippi's students with disabilities. RDA aligns all components of accountability in a manner that best supports LEAs in improving results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities and their families.

The RDA, a data-driven process, focuses on areas of compliance that impact results for children and youth with disabilities and supports a more balanced approach to determine program effectiveness in special education.

---

[1] The federal regulations that require and give MDE authority under which the MDE OSE monitors for programmatic accountability and compliance include:

- Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations (34 CFR) Part 300 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- 34 CFR Part 75-77 Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)
- 2 CFR Part 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards
- 2 CFR Part 3474 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements (as adopted by the U.S. Department of Education)
- 2 CFR Part 180 OMB Guidelines to agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (non-procurement)
- 2 CFR Part 3485 Non-Procurement Debarment and Suspension
- Procedures for State Board Policy 74.19

Mississippi's RDA system includes three major components:

- Annual Performance Report
- Annual LEA Determinations
- Monitoring and Technical Assistance

This document describes the programmatic monitoring and technical assistance component.

Programmatic Monitoring System Activities

The MDE OSE implements a differentiated programmatic accountability and support system to ensure LEAs meet the requirements of IDEA. The system includes three levels of monitoring:
- Universal Monitoring
- Cyclical Monitoring
- Targeted Monitoring
- Intensive Risk-Based Monitoring

The term LEA is defined as a traditional public school district or charter school. As part of monitoring an LEA, MDE OSE monitors compliance for any student placed by the LEA in a placement outside the LEA, including an Educable Child Facility, a university-based program, or a private school or program. Each LEA is responsible for the compliance and oversight of any out-of-district program in which a student is placed to ensure that it operates in accordance with all federal and state special education laws and regulations.

Universal Monitoring
Universal monitoring activities are conducted for all LEAs each year and include: IDEA project application review; state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) data review; annual LEA determinations; dispute resolution, programmatic monitoring; and an annual risk assessment.

Each LEA is monitored annually as part of the MDE OSE **review and approval of the LEA's IDEA project application and budget submission** in the Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-based System (MCAPS) demonstrating eligibility for IDEA Part B grant awards. In addition to the required assurances described in [34 CFR §300.200](#) and evidence that the LEA is meeting select assurances, the application includes separate program plans for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) and parentally placed private school students.

Each LEA that is reserving funds for CEIS, either voluntary or required, must submit a CEIS plan in its Application for Funds. LEAs must provide detailed information outlining the identified areas of disproportionality (for comprehensive CEIS [CCEIS]), areas the funds will target (i.e., grade levels, schools, professional development, etc.), how these funds will be used to address disproportionality in the LEA (for CCEIS), and the specific interventions or strategies to be implemented. The MDE OSE reviews each plan for compliance.

Each LEA with private schools that meet the definition of elementary or secondary school within its jurisdiction is responsible for conducting child find activities and holding timely and meaningful consultations with representatives of the private school and parents of parentally placed private school children with disabilities. MDE OSE requires LEAs to budget a proportionate share of funds to provide services to parentally placed private school students. This amount is calculated automatically through MCAPS based on self-reported child count data. Additionally, LEAs are required to upload a signed affirmation upon completion of timely

and meaningful consultation, signed by representatives of the participating private schools. The expectation of MDE OSE is that consultation occurs continuously throughout the school year.

Annually the MDE OSE collects **SPP/APR data** from each LEA for compliance and results indicators. These indicators are listed for reference in Appendix A. Data are used for reporting in the SPP/APR, reporting to the public on the performance of each LEA, and to make **annual LEA determinations**. Through this determination process, LEAs are identified with one of four determinations: Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention. The MDE OSE makes a finding of noncompliance for each compliance indicator for which the LEA does not show compliance; requires individual and systemic, when appropriate, corrective actions; provides targeted technical assistance; and verifies correction of noncompliance through the review of subsequent data.

In Mississippi, there are several mechanisms available to resolve **disputes and complaints**. These dispute resolution mechanisms include voluntary mediation, Formal State Complaint, due process hearings, and resolution sessions. The MDE OSE reviews the outcomes and findings of substantiated complaints and due process hearings. Where appropriate and required, MDE OSE issues findings, requires corrective actions, and verifies correction of noncompliance. Volume III of MDE OSE's Procedures for State Board Policy 74.19 details Procedural Safeguards, Dispute Resolution, and Confidentiality.

Each year, the MDE OSE completes a **risk-based assessment** for each LEA based on criteria related to compliance with IDEA requirements, outcomes for students with disabilities, and the overall health of the school system. The tool assesses risk and differentiates levels of monitoring to identify and respond to emerging and emergency issues. Additionally, MDE OSE uses the results of the risk assessment to determine LEAs selected for intensive risk-based monitoring.

Cyclical Monitoring
The MDE OSE conducts cyclical programmatic monitoring on the same five-year cycle as MDE OSE's fiscal monitoring. Cyclical monitoring ensures that the MDE OSE Programmatic Monitoring Team monitors each LEA to examine LEA compliance with federal and state special education requirements related to priority areas at least once every five years.

The sample of LEAs identified for cyclical monitoring in a specific year is referred to as a cohort. LEAs are organized into cohorts by LEA type (regular school district or LEA charter school) and financial data, including each LEA's MOE amount and the size of its IDEA Part B section 611 award to ensure a representative distribution of LEAs across cohorts. State-operated agencies or facilities (e.g., Mississippi School for the Blind and Mississippi School for the Deaf) are not included in cyclical monitoring and are monitored every year.

Cyclical monitoring occurs each fall, from August to December. Each LEA cohort is notified of the upcoming self-assessment activity, and MDE OSE holds a training for LEAs selected for cyclical monitoring. Each LEA that is required to complete an LEA self-assessment is notified no less than 30 days prior to its scheduled self-assessment due date. The self-assessment and all required documentation must be submitted to MDE OSE on or before the due date.

Self-Assessment
The MDE OSE facilitates the opportunity for self-assessment as a method of analyzing the implementation of IDEA, which requires each LEA to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. Self-assessment offers a way for LEAs to conduct an analysis of their special education program, including the review of student files and

data to determine whether the system is achieving the intended outcomes for students with disabilities. There are seven components of the self-assessment process: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), Child Find (CF), Individualized Education Program (IEP), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Secondary Transition (TRAN), Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), and Discipline (DIS). The FAPE and Child Find components include a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices in addition to student file reviews.

Upon completion of the LEA self-assessment, the MDE OSE's monitoring team conducts validation checks to ensure accuracy, identifies areas for additional training for individual LEAs and across the LEA cohort, and issues findings of noncompliance when it is identified.

Interview and Additional Information

Cyclical monitoring may also include follow-up interviews, on-site visits, or requests for additional information based on the review of self-assessment data. Based on the risk assessment results and MDE OSE's review of LEA information, the MDE OSE may also select any LEA scheduled for cyclical monitoring to participate in intensive risk-based monitoring as necessary.

Targeted Monitoring

The MDE OSE conducts targeted programmatic and fiscal monitoring as needed. Targeted monitoring is typically limited in scope to specific instances of frequent or systemic noncompliance in a singular area. The purpose of targeted monitoring to direct the provision of technical assistance from the MDE OSE to the LEA based on the area being targeted. LEAs can be identified for targeted monitoring through the general supervision team's bi-monthly review of data, substantiated credible allegations, or universal monitoring activities. It should be noted that the MDE OSE reserves the right to implement cyclical or intensive monitoring based on findings during targeted monitoring.

Intensive Monitoring

The purpose of intensive monitoring is to determine compliance with federal and state laws for serving students with disabilities, to direct the provision of technical assistance from the MDE OSE to the LEA, and to assist the LEA in developing a continuous improvement process.

Each year, the MDE OSE completes a program risk assessment for all LEAs to determine their risk of potential noncompliance. LEA risk is calculated based on the following indicators:
- LEA School Improvement Identifications
- LEA annual determinations
- LEA resolution of findings from parent complaints within timelines
- LEA performance on SPP/APR compliance indicators (11, 12, and 13)
- LEA correction of monitoring findings within timelines
- Identification of significant disproportionality in the LEA
- Experience of the LEA Special Education Director (in the position for three or fewer years)

The criteria for risk may be adjusted each year to reflect MDE OSE priorities or new learning. LEAs receive partial points on a sliding scale for each indicator. The sum for each LEA is then calculated to produce a percentage (total LEA points/total possible points). Based on the annual risk assessment score, each entity is classified into a risk category, with cutoffs established based on the annual review of the data, using the following as a guideline:

- Low risk: Below the 50th percentile
- Medium risk: Between the 50th and 69th percentiles
- High risk: Between the 70th and 89th percentiles
- Extremely high risk: Above the 90th percentile

LEAs identified with extremely high risk or the LEAs with the top 10 highest risk assessment scores, are required to participate in intensive monitoring activities, regardless of when they last participated in cyclical, targeted, or other monitoring activities. While MDE does not make risk assessment scores publicly available, MDE OSE sends each LEA identified for intensive risk-based monitoring its final risk score.

In addition to any LEA identified as having extremely high risk, MDE OSE may select LEAs from the cyclical monitoring cohort with the highest risk. Intensive monitoring may also be conducted as the result of:

- a determination of "needs substantial intervention;"
- a notification from the Office of Accreditation that an LEA's accreditation is at risk; or
- emerging or emergency issues identified through uncorrected findings of noncompliance, findings from the LEA self-assessment, or other available information.

If an LEA is selected for intensive risk-based monitoring for two or three subsequent years, the MDE OSE will determine, based on the status of the LEA's previous monitoring, whether additional on-site monitoring is necessary. If the MDE OSE determines additional monitoring is not necessary because it did not identify noncompliance during the previous monitoring visit or the LEA corrected each finding of noncompliance, the MDE OSE will select the LEA with the next highest risk score for monitoring. If the LEA has been identified as extremely high risk for four consecutive years, the MDE OSE will conduct an on-site monitoring visit.

Intensive risk-based monitoring is differentiated based on each LEA's data. The monitoring team prioritizes areas for review based on:

- findings of noncompliance and areas determined through the state's risk assessment, including:
  - noncompliance with the SPP/APR compliance indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;
  - not meeting state targets or showing improvement toward the target for consecutive years on SPP/APR indicators 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14;
  - failure to submit timely, valid, and reliable data.
- findings of noncompliance identified in the LEA's self-assessment; and
- other information available to MDE indicating the need for on-site monitoring.

Each LEA selected for intensive risk-based monitoring receives a notification letter at least 30 days prior to the on-site visit with an overview of the site visit protocols and documents that will be reviewed. Visits occur between February through May of each year.

Preparation for On-Site Monitoring
Each year, the MDE OSE assigns a staff member to serve as the LEA's point of contact throughout the on-site monitoring cycle. Monitoring the implementation of corrective action plans and providing differentiated technical assistance to best support the LEA's needs may be provided by the MDE OSE program monitoring staff. A MDE OSE staff member will conduct a pre−on- site visit meeting with designated members of the LEA team to: provide an overview of the prioritized focus areas for the monitoring visit; address questions from the LEA in preparation for the monitoring visit; review the on-site monitoring protocol; and facilitate information gathering necessary for the on-site visit.

On-Site Monitoring
Cyclical, Targeted, and Cyclical on-site monitoring activities consists of, but is not limited to:

- Entrance Meeting – The MDE OSE monitoring team provides a description of the scope and purpose of the monitoring, requests additional information from the LEA, and verifies the information required to complete the monitoring visit is available at the site.
- Detailed File Review – The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams conduct a detailed review of a selected sample of student files.
- Interviews – The MDE OSE monitoring team interviews key staff who are

knowledgeable and experienced in priority areas and parents.

- Classroom Observations – The MDE OSE monitoring team may visit schools and classrooms to verify the results of the student file reviews and pre–on-site data reviews, verify that students are receiving the special education and related services on their IEPs in the least restrictive environment, and observe any promising practices occurring in schools.
- Review of Policies and Procedures – The MDE OSE monitoring team may review LEA policies and procedures to identify areas for improvement in the LEA's system or infrastructure that may be contributing to noncompliance.
- Exit interview – The MDE OSE team holds an exit interview with appropriate LEA staff when the monitoring visit is completed. Problem areas are discussed in general terms.

Monitoring Report

A monitoring report with findings of noncompliance and areas for improvement is sent to each LEA within 90 days of the MDE OSE validation of the self-assessment or on-site visit and a copy of the report is filed in the master monitoring folder. The report includes:

- Monitoring objectives, scope, and methodology
- Findings of noncompliance:
    - The standard or criteria (regulation, directive, or contract clause, etc.)
    - The condition found, level of compliance, or other reason for the finding
    - Any required corrective actions and timelines
    - Required evidence for verification of correction and systemic improvement
- Areas identified for improvement including recommendations or required actions

Each finding of noncompliance must be corrected in a timely manner and in no case take longer than one year from the date of identification. The MDE OSE may establish shorter timelines for correction. MDE OSE conducts a follow-up call with each LEA to review the report. Depending on the extent of noncompliance, LEAs may be required to submit a detailed corrective action or improvement plan, including specific steps to be taken and an associated timeline to resolve noncompliance, implement internal controls, and submit data demonstrating correction and systemic improvement.

Verification of Correction of Noncompliance

Pursuant to Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memo 09-02, the MDE OSE verifies correction of each finding of noncompliance, including correction of individual findings and the review of subsequent data demonstrating compliance. If an LEA does not correct identified noncompliance within one year of the notification of a finding, MDE OSE takes additional actions to ensure correction.

Incentive and Enforcement Mechanisms

MDE OSE's Results Driven Accountability system includes a system of incentives and sanctions. Each LEA must respond in writing to all monitoring findings. If an LEA does not respond or take action to correct identified noncompliance within a reasonable time, as required, the MDE OSE will take additional actions. Potential MDE OSE incentive and enforcement options available to use with the LEA include:

- Technical assistance based on LEA's specific area(s) of need
- Decreased reporting requirements when noncompliance is corrected in a shorter timeline
- Recognition of timely correction through points added to determinations or risk assessment scores
- Additional on-site monitoring
- Special conditions on the LEA's IDEA subgrant awards

- Directing the use of or withholding IDEA funds
- Accreditation actions and sanctions
- State takeover with state oversight

Programmatic Technical Assistance

The MDE OSE provides differentiated technical assistance and supports to LEAs that are informed by its monitoring activities. Technical assistance is provided as an integral part of the accountability system and includes face-to-face and virtual trainings, training materials, state guidance, and procedural documents. MDE's technical assistance system includes three levels of support.

Universal

MDE OSE provides universal technical assistance to ensure that all LEAs comply with applicable federal statutes and regulations. The topics of universal technical assistance are decided upon based on a review of common questions from LEAs and a reflection on common findings made during monitoring activities.

Cyclical

MDE OSE provides cyclical technical assistance to each LEA as follow-up to cyclical monitoring to ensure compliance and corrective action on part of the LEA. Cyclical technical assistance is provided until all findings are resolved and improvement plans completed. Cyclical technical assistance is also provided at the request of the LEA through researching and responding to questions, providing training, and developing templates and resources.

Intensive

MDE OSE provides intensive technical assistance to LEAs identified as "extremely high risk" to ensure proper corrective action and compliance with federal and state statutes and regulations. At a minimum, MDE OSE holds monthly calls with each identified LEA, and intensive technical assistance is provided until all findings are resolved.

Appendices

Appendix A: Part B SPP/APR Indicators
Appendix B: OSEP Memorandum 09-02
Appendix C: Cyclical Monitoring Protocol
Appendix D: Risk Rubric
Appendix E: Intensive Monitoring Protocol
Appendix F: Sample Timeline of Monitoring Activities and Communication to LEAs

Appendix A: Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. *Graduation*
2. *Drop out*
3. *Assessment*
4. *Suspension/Expulsion*
5. *Education Environments (School Age)*
6. *Preschool Environments*
7. *Preschool Outcomes*
8. *Parent Involvement*
9. *Disproportionate Representation*
10. *Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories*
11. *Child Find*
12. *Early Childhood Transition*
13. *Secondary Transition*
14. *Post-School Outcomes*
15. *Resolution Sessions*
16. *Mediations*
17. *State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)*
18. *General Supervision*

IDC's Indicator Card – Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR
IDC's Indicator Card – Part B FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR

Appendix C: Cyclical Monitoring Protocol

INTRODUCTION

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) Office of Special Education (OSE) facilitates the opportunity for self-monitoring as a method of analyzing the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which requires a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. This self-assessment monitoring tool offers a way for LEAs to conduct an analysis of their special education program, including the review of data to determine whether the system is achieving the intended outcomes for students with disabilities. Local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for cyclical targeted monitoring must complete the self-assessment as a required activity; however, the MDE OSE also encourages self-assessment monitoring as an activity for all LEAs at any time to identify areas for improvement.

The primary goal of the self-assessment is to identify areas for potential improvement and technical assistance for LEA and school staff who participate in the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). LEAs may also use it to explore the strengths and weaknesses of local special education programs and consider the impact of each component on student achievement. When completed with fidelity, MDE OSE expects this activity will be helpful in identifying the root causes of performance and compliance issues in school systems. When coupled with other LEA planning activities, results may also help inform fiscal decisions as they relate to strategic and targeted use of federal IDEA Part B funds.

Components

There are seven components of the self-assessment process: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), Child Find (CF), Individualized Education Program (IEP), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Secondary Transition (TRAN), Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), and Discipline (DIS). A bank of questions, referred to as standards, should be used to analyze the LEA's evidence of implementation for these seven components. The LEA is required to sample student files to fulfill the requirements of some standards, while other components will query the LEA's polices, procedures, and practices in addition to a sample of student files.

Each standard is supported by a compliance regulation that will help the LEA's self-assessment team understand IDEA and state requirements. The results of this process will assist Special Education Directors in identifying and correcting potential noncompliance, determining how student performance has been impacted, and working with the state to develop a plan for improvement.

Citations

For the purpose of potential noncompliance and identifying areas where the state will examine evidence of compliance, regulatory citations are provided. Citations included in this document refer to regulatory requirements determined to be most closely related to the area(s) being addressed. Citations included in this document are not intended to be comprehensive but broadly capture the intent of the component or standard being addressed.

Planning and Preparation

The LEA should identify key staff to serve on the self-assessment team. Team member selection is at the discretion of the LEA; however, MDE OSE recommends including knowledgeable and experienced individuals such as the Special Education Director, IEP facilitators, behavior interventionists, related service providers, and building administrators.

Activities

The self-assessment consists of a review of student files related to each of the seven components and a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices for the FAPE and Child Find components. The MDE OSE will review policies and procedures for each component during on-site monitoring activities and recommends that each LEA routinely review its policies and procedures.

Identifying a Sample

The LEA must select a targeted sample of student files for the FAPE, CF, IEP, LRE , TRAN, ECSE, and DIS components. The sample files selected should be a reasonable representation of students with disabilities served within the LEA.

MONITORING SAMPLE SIZE CHART							
Number of students in special education	20 or Less	21–100	101–250	251–500	501–750	751-1999	2000+
Number of eligible student files	All	20	30	40	55	10%	5%

Selection Criteria:

The sample **must** include the following if available in the LEA (one student file may meet multiple criteria):

- students with an initial evaluation and placement in the past year (10% of sample);
- students with a reevaluation in the past year that includes **both** comprehensive assessments and reevaluations with a review of existing data that does not require comprehensive assessments (10% of sample)
- students in a self-contained setting (10% of sample)
- students who turned 3 during the past year and transitioned from Part B to C services (10% of sample);
- students age 14 and older on both the regular and alternate diploma tracks (10% of sample);
- students who participated in the alternate assessment (at least one file);
- if the LEA was identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion rates (Indicator 4a), students who were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days (10% of sample);
- if the LEA was identified as having significant disproportionality, at least one student from each race/ethnicity group and area of disproportionality identified; and
- students placed in alternate settings used by the LEA, if applicable.
- at least one homebound student, if applicable.

The sample **should** also include, to the extent possible:

- students from different disability categories;
- students with a range of age and grade levels; and
- students named in a Formal State Complaint or Due Process in the last year.

If the LEA wants to further explore the impact of noncompliance on outcomes for students with disabilities, the sample **may** include:

- students attending each school in the LEA (if all schools are not represented, include students from schools with both low and high rates of placement in general education settings and both low and high assessment scores for students

with disabilities);
- students failing two or more core subjects;
- students that have repeated a grade; and
- students attending schools with the highest percentage of discipline removals (both in school and out of school) of greater than ten (10) days in a school year.

Self-assessment Student List

As files are selected, record them on the Self-assessment Student List form provided. The form was developed to verify that the required areas are represented in the sample of student files. Complete the "Identifying Information" as you choose students for the self-assessment. Assign each student a number beginning with one (1) and use that number to represent that student on the score sheets for each component in the self-assessment. Include the required number of files based on the selection criteria in the "Monitoring Sample Size Chart." Be sure to include, to the extent possible, students from different disability categories and students with a range of age and grade levels. Use the boxes below the "Selection Criteria Required Areas" to indicate which student files satisfy that criterion with an "X". Keep in mind, some students may satisfy multiple criteria.

To determine which student files will be reviewed for the Child Find, Transition, Early Childhood Special Education and Discipline components, use the following guidelines:
- Files indicated as "Students in SC Settings" - review for FAPE-2;
- Files indicated as "Initial Evaluation" - review for Child Find 1-2;
- Files indicated as "Reevaluation" - review for Child Find Reevaluation 1;
- Files indicated as "Age 14 and Older" - review for Transition 1-6;
- Files indicated as "Part C to B" - review for Early Childhood Special Education 1-4; and
- Files indicated as "Discipline Removals" - review for Discipline 1-6.

These guidelines are to be used to identify which student files were reviewed for the each of the seven (7) components:
- FAPE – identify all files reviewed for FAPE-2
- CF – identify all files reviewed for CF-1, CF-2 and CFR-1
- IEP file review - choose 1/2 of the students listed to review for IEP 1-10. Include any student with a Formal State Complaint or Due Process **and** Part C to B, Transition, and Discipline students in the IEP review, along with a good selection of different ages and disabilities. IEPs reviewed will need to include the prior year IEP to review for ESY. LRE file review – choose the remaining 1/2 of the student list for LRE 1-4.
- TRAN – identify all files reviewed for TRAN 1-6
- ECSE – identify all files reviewed for ECSE
- DISC – identify all files reviewed for DISC

SELF-ASSESSMENT STUDENT LIST

District -

	Identifying Information						Selection Criteria Required Areas											Component Areas						
Student Number	MSIS Number	Student Name (last, first)	Age	Race	Disability Category(s)	School	Initial Evaluation (10% of Sample)	Reeval with & without Assessment (10% of Sample)	Students in SC Setting (10% of sample)	Part C to B 3-year-olds (10% of Sample)	Age 14 and older; Reg. and Alt. Diploma Track (10% of Sample)	Alternate Assessment Student (at least 1)	Homebound (at least 1 if applicable)	Disc. Removals of 10/10+ Days (10% of Sample)	Formal State Complaint or Due Process (All Students)	Identified by Significant Dispropor. District Data (10% of Sample)	FAPE (all applicable)	CF (all applicable)	IEP (1/2 of files)	LRE (1/2 of files)	TRAN (all applicable)	ECSE (all applicable)	DISC (all applicable)
1																							
2																							
3																							

Student File Organization

As record reviews are conducted, organize the student files used as evidence of compliance or non-compliance to be uploaded into SharePoint at the conclusion of the self-assessment. Use the "Potential Sources of Documentation" box on each record review item as a guideline for what can be used as evidence. Evidence should be uploaded with all pages facing the same direction and with most current at the beginning. When uploading IEPs, be sure to include the Notice of Committee Meeting and Prior Written Notice, along with any other documents pertaining to that IEP (FBA, BIP, Amendment, etc.).

Understanding Compliance and Correction

Documentation and Evidence

For each of the components on the self-assessment tool, a rubric is provided which includes a specific list of documentation (information to look *at*) and evidence (information to look *for*) that must be considered during the review of each standard. This information is provided as a guide for locating information that may serve as evidence of implementation. However, the LEA may use additional evidence when needed to support this process as it finds necessary.

Addressing Evidence of Implementation

For each item or question, indicate the item that best represents how the LEA's procedures or student reviews compare to the standard or question for each of the main self-assessment components. "**Yes**" indicates the LEA reviewed evidence that the IEP meets the standard. "**No**" indicates the LEA did not find evidence of implementation of that standard. If a question or a component area is not applicable, then the LEA may select "**Not Applicable**" (N/A) in the appropriate section of the document. The N/A should only be used if a standard does not apply to a particular situation. It may not be used as an alternative for not fully implementing a standard (e.g., if a student is not 14, so does not have a transition plan or was not reevaluated in the last year). The team should carefully review all documentation and evidence. Prior to making a final determination of compliance for each standard, MDE OSE will review provided evidence. The LEA will be required to correct any instance of noncompliance upon notification by MDE OSE.

Correction of Noncompliance

If through its review MDE OSE finds that an LEA is noncompliant in any of the self-assessment standards, the LEA will receive a written finding notifying the LEA of noncompliance and be required to:

- Correct each instance of noncompliance for each individual student immediately and provide documentation to MDE OSE;
- Maintain documentation to validate the LEA has corrected all issues of noncompliance in the local self-assessment files; and
- Once individual instances of noncompliance have been corrected, conduct follow-up reviews of new files to demonstrate through subsequent data that the LEA is implementing the regulations correctly for a period of time to be set by MDE OSE. Follow-up by MDE OSE will continue until the LEA is implementing the regulations correctly within one year of identification.

If the LEA identifies potential noncompliance, the LEA should identify the steps it will take to correct the potential noncompliance by developing a plan for correction on the results summary document provided.

Submission of Results

The self-assessment results and associated student files should be submitted to the MDE OSE electronically according to the monitoring schedule.

Compliance Audits and Identification of Overarching Training Needs

After submitting the self-assessment results and student files to the agency, the MDE OSE's monitoring team will conduct validation checks to ensure the compliance results of the self-assessment accurately represent the compliance standard and identify areas for additional training for LEAs participating in the self-assessment. The worth of the self-assessment relies on the validity of the process and the accuracy of data submitted by LEAs.

SELF-ASSESSMENT TEAM CHECKLIST

Required Activity	Recommendations and Action Steps
1. Special Education Director selects team members to participate in the self-assessment process	Identify a team leader to oversee the self-assessment process and a team of individuals to conduct the review. The team should include individuals from multiple disciplines. This may include, but is not limited to: • Special education teachers • Guidance counselors • Social workers • Behavior interventionists • General education teachers • School psychologists • Related service personnel • Principal or assistant principal.
2. Conduct an initial meeting with team members to discuss process timelines and assign responsibilities	Assign team members to: • Identify the sample of students • Complete the student record reviews • Conduct interviews and observations, if needed* • Complete other relevant tasks. *Interviews and observations may be conducted as an optional activity if additional information is needed to make a definitive decision regarding evidence of implementation.
3. Identify student files to review and consult additional data sources	• Refer to the sample selection instructions. • Consult relevant data sources (e.g., performance profile, LEA Determination, report cards, assessment results, other school level data, parent survey data). • Identify additional records to review if inconclusive patterns are found.
4. Complete required self-assessment	• Review LEA policies, practices, and procedures for the Child Find procedural review. • Conduct student file reviews for LRE, IEP, Discipline, Secondary Transition, and ECSE.
5. Convene a review team meeting to discuss self-assessment results	• Meet to discuss results. • Question and probe results to identify patterns and/or factors which may have contributed to a lack of growth in student achievement (*root cause analysis*).
6. Compile results and summary	Assign a person to compile data from record review score sheets and transfer the findings to the results summary document.
7. Submit completed self-assessment to the Mississippi Department of Education	Upload score sheets, results summary document, and student files with supporting documentation to SharePoint.

COMPONENT A: FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION

Understanding Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE):

Under 34 CFR §300.17, §§300.101 through 300.108 and State Board Policy Chapter 74, Rule 74.19, LEAs are required to provide a Free Appropriate Education (FAPE) to all children with disabilities residing in the state between the ages of three (3) and twenty (20), inclusive. FAPE means special education and related services: that are provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge; that meet the standards of the MDE and the requirements of the IDEA 2004 regulations; that include an appropriate preschool, elementary school, or secondary school in Mississippi; and that are provided in conformity with an individualized education program (IEP) that meets the requirements of §§300.320 through 300.124. The FAPE mandate applies to all students enrolled in a public school with the exception of students who have graduated with a standard high school diploma.

An LEA's FAPE policies and procedures must ensure the following:
- Provision of FAPE through the development implementation of special education services and/or related services; and
- Physical education is available to all students with disabilities
- Students with disabilities receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers, students with a shortened school day have individual justifications for placement on the IEP, and students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.
- Graduation options for students with disabilities are documented.

The purpose of this section is to ensure the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices for FAPE for students with disabilities. This review analyzes whether the LEA has demonstrated procedural compliance as it relates to FAPE oversight activities in general.

Instructions for the Review:

The FAPE procedural review should follow the steps below:

1. Identify at least one staff person who is knowledgeable about the requirements of FAPE.
2. Review the LEA's policies, procedures, and any additional documentation in order to respond to the FAPE standards.
3. If the LEA has evidence to support full implementation of a FAPE standard, then mark "Yes" next to the standard. If the LEA is unable to validate full implementation of the standard, then mark "No" next to the standard.
4. Record results on the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA identifies potential noncompliance with a standard include a plan for correction on the Results Summary Form.
6. Collect and organize required and supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: FAPE-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.101(1)(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the provisions of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities?	• Board approved policies • Procedure Manual
RESULT & COMPLIANCE	
☐ **YES*** ☐ The public agency has documented **policies** approved by the school board **and procedures** to guide implementation. ☐ Policies and procedures should ensure FAPE must be available to all children with disabilities residing in Mississippi between the ages of three (3) and twenty (20). *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **NO** Policies and/or procedures are nonexistent, insufficient, or inconsistent with SBP 74.19/IDEA.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: FAPE-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.108

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the public agency have physical education (PE) available to all students with disabilities?	• Random samples of class schedules for students in self-contained placements • Files/IEPs for students not receiving PE
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES*** ☐ All students with disabilities receive PE, as provided for their nondisabled peers, including specially designed instruction if needed as described in the IEP. ☐ If students are not receiving PE, there is a documented medical reason or PE is not provided for non-disabled peers. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **NO** There are students who do not receive PE and have no documentation of a medical reason in the student's file.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: FAPE-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.101

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION

Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the following provisions of a FAPE for students with disabilities? Is there evidence that the LEA consistently follows the process?
  A. Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers (i.e. buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers).
  B. Students with a shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement on the IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents/guardians.
  C. Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.
	FAPE-3 A. & B.
	• Board approved policies
	• Procedure Manual
	• School Master Schedule
	• IEP PLAAFP
	• IEP LRE section
	• IEP Transportation section
	• IEP Progress Monitoring
	• Report Cards
	• School Bell Schedule
	• Bus Schedules
	• Interviews
	
	FAPE-3 C.
	• Board approved policies
	• Procedure Manual
	• Attendance Report
	• Discipline Report
	• IEPs
	• IEP Progress Monitoring
	• Report Cards
	• Interviews

RESULT & COMPLIANACE/EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES*** ☐ Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers or have justification of the shortened school day in their IEPs. ☐ Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services. ☐ The public agency has documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures that address A, B, and C. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **NO*** ☐ Transportation/ school schedules indicate arrival and departure times that are not comparable to non-disabled students with no justifications in their IEPs. ☐ Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days do not receive special education and/or related services. *Either of the above may indicate noncompliance and ☐ The public agency does not have documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures that address A, B, and C.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: FAPE-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.101 and 300.102

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the graduation requirements?	• Board approved policies • Procedure Manual

RESULT & COMPLIANCE	
☐ **YES** The public agency has documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.	☐ **NO** The public agency does not have documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT A – FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION (FAPE)– SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION
LEA Name:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: For FAPE-1, -3, and −4, enter "Yes" if evidence of policies and procedures was found and list "No" if evidence of policies and procedures was not found or if policies and procedures were insufficient. For FAPE-2, list the student number of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if no evidence was found.

Standard	Policies
FAPE-1 §300.101(1)(b)	
FAPE-3A §300.101	
FAPE-3B §300.101	
FAPE-3C §300.101	
FAPE-4 §§300.101, 300.102	

Student Number	FAPE-2 §300.108

COMPONENT B: CHILD FIND B: CHILD FIND

Understanding Child Find (CF):

Under 34 CFR §300.111 and State Board Policy Chapter 74, Rule 74.19, LEAs are required to identify, locate, and evaluate students with disabilities. The Child Find mandate applies to all students who reside within a state, including students who attend private and public schools, highly mobile students, migrant students, homeless students, and students who are wards of the state. This includes all students who are suspected of having a disability, including students who receive passing grades and are "advancing from grade to grade."

An LEA's Child Find policies and procedures must ensure the following:
- Measures to identify, locate, and evaluate all students with disabilities, regardless of the severity of the disability; and
- Procedures to determine which students will receive special education and related services.

The purpose of this section is to ensure the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures for Child Find do not present any barriers to locating and evaluating students. This review analyzes whether the LEA has demonstrated procedural compliance as it relates to Child Find oversight activities in general and aligns with Indicator 11 in the Annual Performance Report (APR), a component of the IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP). Indicator 11 reports annually on whether the LEA completes evaluations within the required 60 calendar days as required under 34 CFR §300.301.

Instructions for the Review:

The Child Find procedural review should follow the steps below:
1. Identify at least one staff person who is knowledgeable about the requirements of Child Find.
2. Review the LEA's policies, procedures, and any additional documentation in order to respond to the Child Find standards.
3. If the LEA has evidence to support full implementation of a Child Find standard, then mark "Yes" next to the standard. If the LEA is unable to validate full implementation of the standard, then mark "No" next to the standard.
4. Record results on the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA identifies potential noncompliance with a standard include a plan for correction

on the Results Summary Form.

6. Collect and organize required and supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

CHILD FIND (CF)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: CF-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.111(a)-(c)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the LEA have Child Find policies and procedures in effect for all students, including students who are: A. Homeless, B. Wards of the state, C. In private schools at parental expense, D. Advancing from grade to grade, and E. Highly mobile and/or migrant?	• Child Find policies (e.g., policy manual) • Child Find procedures (e.g., procedures manual) • Any forms used for implementing Child Find procedures • Posters/brochures • Evidence of Child Find activities with non-public schools • Documentation of referrals • Indicator 11 Data – Evaluation timelines
RESULT & COMPLIANCE	
☐ **Yes*** ☐ Child Find policies and procedures are written and available. ☐ Procedures provide sufficient guidance on how to implement Child Find activities. ☐ Child Find procedures address all of the following: homeless children, private school children, general population of students, and migrant children. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **No*** ☐ Child Find procedures are unavailable. ☐ Child Find procedures are inconsistent with the criteria indicated above. *Either of the above may indicate noncompliance.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: CF-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.301

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the LEA have a process in place for receiving and documenting verbal and written requests for evaluations from parents and others? Is there evidence that the LEA consistently follows the process? Is this process implemented in private schools?	• Evaluation reports • Referral documentation • Intervention data/logs • Parental requests and consent • Parental complaints • Indicator 11 – Evaluation timelines

RESULT & COMPLIANCE/EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **Yes***	☐ **No***
☐ Child Find procedures are followed consistently when receiving and documenting written and verbal requests for a comprehensive evaluation from parents. ☐ A written process is established for implementing Child Find activities and there is evidence of implementation.	☐ Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are non-existent, insufficient, or inconsistent with IDEA. ☐ Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are not followed, resulting in a failure to document requests received and/or respond to requests in a timely manner.

☐ Policies and procedures address handling Child Find at times when school is not in session; procedures are not limited by a total number per year. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	*Either of the above may indicate noncompliance.

CHILD FIND REEVALUATION (CFR)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: CFR-1 REGULATION 34 CFR 300.303(1)(2)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the public agency ensure that reevaluations are provided for each IDEA eligible student within the required three-year period?	• IEPs • Eligibility Determination Forms • PWNs • Notices to Parents
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The record shows that a reevaluation was conducted at least once every three (3) years.	☐ **NO** The record shows that a reevaluation was not conducted within a three (3) year period.

Group Discussion Questions:
- Does the LEA have a standard set of Child Find procedures currently in place that are available and being implemented?
- Do these activities cover the broad scope of Child Find under IDEA 34 CFR §300.111?
- Were appropriate considerations made related to identifying, locating, and evaluating students, including students who are parentally placed in private schools, experiencing homelessness, wards of the state, and of the general school population?
- Were the LEA's Child Find activities fully implemented? If so, to what extent and is there sufficient documentation available to ensure timely services to students?
- Were initial evaluations conducted within 60 calendar days after receiving parental consent? If not, what barriers prevent the timely dissemination of results? What are the appropriate interventions to correct the problem.

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT B – CHILD FIND (CF) & REVALUATION (CFR)– SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if no evidence was found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Standard	Policies
CF-1 **§300.111(a)-(c)**	
CF-1A	
CF-1B	
CF-1C	
CF-1D	
CF-1E	

Student Number	CF-1 §300.111(a)-(c)	CF-2 §300.301	CFR-1 §300.303(1)(2)

COMPONENT C: INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

Understanding Individualized Education Program (IEP):

The effective and consistent development of IEPs is a critical component in the performance outcomes of students with disabilities. The results of the multidisciplinary evaluation and the student's IEP outline the educational needs and supports that are necessary for the student to progress in the general education curriculum. When the IEP is implemented consistently according to the unique needs of the student, the student is expected to show improvements in academic performance.

The student's IEP is reviewed by the IEP committee at least once a year or more often if the parent(s) or school asks for a review. Parents, as committee members, must be invited to attend these meetings and afforded every opportunity to be active participants in this process.

By law, the IEP must include certain information about the student and the educational program designed to meet their unique needs. This includes:

- **Special education and related services**. The IEP must list the special education and related services to be provided to students. This includes supplementary aids and services the student needs. It also includes modifications and accommodations to the program and supports for school personnel.
- **Current performance**. The IEP must state how the student is currently doing in school (known as present levels of educational performance). Examples of sources of current student performance may include classroom tests and assignments, individual tests given to decide eligibility for services or during reevaluation, current progress monitoring data, and observations made by parents, teachers, related service providers, and other school staff. The statement about "current performance" includes how the student's disability affects their involvement and progress in the general curriculum.
- **Annual goals**. These are goals that the student can reasonably accomplish in a year. Goals may include functional, behavioral, and academic needs, and may also address social emotional skills and relationships, knowledge and skills, relate to physical needs, or address other educational needs. The goals must be measurable, meaning that it must be possible to measure whether the student has achieved the goals.
- **Measuring progress**. The IEP must state how the student's progress will be measured and indicate how often parents will be made aware of that progress.
- **Participation in state and district-wide tests**. All students with disabilities are included in general state and district-wide assessment programs, with appropriate accommodations and alternate assessments where necessary and as indicated in their respective IEP.
- **Dates and location of services**. The IEP must state when services will begin, how often they will be provided, where they will be provided, and how long they will last.
- **Transition services**. Beginning when the student is age 14 (or younger, if appropriate), the IEP must state what transition services are needed to help the student prepare for postsecondary life.
- **Extended School Year Services (ESYS)**. The provision of special education and related services beyond the normal school year and at no cost to the parent.
- **IEP amendment**. Changes made to the IEP at any time. Parent must be notified prior to making these changes.

In this section, the LEA will respond to a series of questions to explore whether it is meeting critical components of FAPE as they relate to the delivery of IEP services. The self-assessment team will review evidence of implementation as guided by the methods of measurement included in the IEP and respond to the standards in the self-assessment. In instances where a lack of implementation exists, the self-assessment team shall determine whether there is evidence of implementation. If MDE OSE identifies noncompliance upon its review of self-assessment and other data, including failure to provide FAPE, MDE OSE will develop an

intervention plan with the LEA.

Instructions for the IEP Review:

1. Identify a team member who is knowledgeable about the development and implementation of IEPs.
2. Complete the IEP review for each student file.
3. Record the responses on the IEP score sheet.
4. Transfer results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA was found noncompliant, develop a plan for correction.
6. Collect and organize required and supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

COMPONENT C – Individualized Education Program (IEP)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.322(a)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Was the parent afforded the opportunity to participate in the IEP meeting?	• Parent contact logs • Prior written notification • IEP committee participant signature page • Other forms of documentation
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** Prior written notice was available. The parent participated or there is evidence that the parent was invited to participate in the IEP meeting.	☐ **NO*** There is no prior written notice available and/or no evidence of an invitation for the parent to participate in the IEP meeting. *There are allowable exceptions to this rule. The LEA may use its discretion to determine whether valid attempts were made to contact the parent(s).*

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(1)(i)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP contain present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general education curriculum?	• IEP • Statement of progress • General student information • Present levels of academic achievement

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance include the following information as it relates to each goal: • Summary of academic, behavioral, and/or functional performance; and • Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal (e.g., formative, curriculum-based, functional behavior assessments).	☐ **NO** Present levels of academic achievement and/or functional performance are not included in the IEP.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(2)(i)(A)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP include annual measurable goals that address the student's academic area of need? A measurable annual goal must contain the following: • Clearly defined behavior: the specific action the student will be expected to perform. • The condition (situation, setting, or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed. • Performance Criteria describing the skill and level of performance that will be achieved in the IEP year.	• Evaluation results • IEP committee recommendations • Consideration of special factors • Measurable annual goals • Examples of methods of measurement

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The IEP includes measurable goals and services that are related to the annual goals.	☐ **NO** The IEP does not contain annual goals, or the goals fail to address the student's needs as identified in the IEP and evaluation results.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(4)−(7)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP indicate the amount, duration, and location where specially designed instruction and other IEP services will occur?	• IEP • Program services • Placement determination checklist • Statement of specifically designed instruction

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The IEP specifically identifies amount, duration, and location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services.	☐ **NO** The IEP does not specify the amount, duration, and/or location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-5 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320 (a)(4)(i)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP identify related services that address the needs of the student and support annual goals? *(Related services: developmental, corrective, and other supportive services as are required to assist a student with a disability to benefit from special education, including but not limited to the following services: speech-language pathology and audiology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility, school health and nursing services, psychological services, social work services, etc.)*	• Program services • Placement determination checklist • Examples of method of measurement • Educational need areas

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION

☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ NOT APPLICABLE
The IEP specifically identifies related services that align with the needs of the student and support achievement of annual goals, when necessary.	The IEP does not specify related services that align with the needs of the student or support annual goals. There is no evidence to support the delivery of related services.	The IEP committee determined the child does not require related services.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-6 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(6)(ii)(A)– (B)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP indicate student participation in the annual statewide assessment?	• Documentation of assessment results • Statewide assessment results • Eligibility criteria checklists, where applicable • Other relevant information

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION

☐ YES	☐ NO
The IEP indicates that the student will participate in a statewide assessment. If the student is participating in an alternate assessment, the IEP indicates the reason. The IEP includes accommodations and/or modifications for participation, if necessary.	The IEP does not address the student's participation in a statewide assessment and/or the IEP does not include justification as to why an alternate assessment is appropriate.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-7 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION	
Has the IEP been reviewed at least annually? Has the IEP been revised or amended to address new and relevant information? Examples of new information may include: • responses to a lack of expected progress toward annual goals; • re-evaluations when new concerns exist; • information about the student provided by the parent or other educators; and/or • anticipated needs or other matters.	• Current IEP with original signatures • Evidence of IEP revisions • Educational need areas • Progress reports • Other relevant information	
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION		
☐ **YES** With the exception of an initial IEP, the IEP has been updated within twelve months from the prior year IEP date and includes relevant information to demonstrate the student's present levels of performance and address the current needs of the student.	☐ **NO** The IEP is dated outside of the one-year timeline and/or no evidence exists to indicate meaningful revisions were made to the IEP.	☐ **NOT APPLICABLE** The IEP is an initial IEP.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-8 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(3)(i)–(ii)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP contain descriptions of how the student's progress toward annual goals will be measured, including how often parents will be informed of the student's progress?	• Progress reports • Methods of measurement
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The IEP indicates how the student's progress will be measured and how often it will be reported to the parent. The record indicates that parents receive progress reports as included in the student's IEP.	☐ **NO** The IEP does not indicate how often progress will be reported to parents or failed to include methods of measurement.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-9 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.106(A)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the IEP committee appropriately consider the need for ESYS?	• ESYS Determination letter • ESYS Student Eligibility Review form • ESYS Documentation forms

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** There is documentation of an ESYS determination in the IEP folder.	☐ **NO** There is no documentation of an ESYS determination in the IEP folder.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: IEP-10 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.324(a)(4)&(6)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
If the IEP was amended, did the LEA follow the procedures and notice requirements for making changes to the IEP?	• Prior Written Notice (PWN) • Amended IEP

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION		
☐ **YES** The IEP Committee may review data about the child's performance collaboratively and make minor changes to the IEP without a formal IEP Committee meeting. If a meeting is not held, each IEP Committee member, including the parent, must be given the opportunity to review all existing data and information. If the IEP needs corrections or minor changes between annual meetings, the IEP Committee may agree to amend the IEP without a meeting as long as (1) the changes and the parent's and public agency's agreement to the changes are in writing, and (2) every member of the IEP Committee is informed of the changes. *NOTE: Changes to the IEP made without a meeting may not involve a redrafting of the entire IEP and may not be substituted for holding an annual meeting.*	☐ **NO** The parent was not notified of changes to the IEP and procedures were not followed to amend the IEP.	☐ **NOT APPLICABLE** The IEP has not been amended without a full IEP committee meeting.

Group Discussion Questions:
- Within the district and schools analyzed, are IEPs being implemented according to the appropriate requirements?
- For students failing one or more subjects, are there patterns in the IEP implementation that appear to be systemic and discrepant?
- Which schools are implementing IEPs with fidelity and which schools are struggling? What patterns exist in these schools?
- Was FAPE provided in every case? If not, what actions will the LEA take to ensure immediate correction?

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT C – Individualized Education Program (IEP) – SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if no evidence was found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Student Number	IEP-1 §300. 322(a)	IEP-2 §300.320 (a)(1)(i)	IEP-3 §300.320 (a)(2)(i) (A)	IEP-4 §300.320 (a)(4)(7)	IEP-5 §300. 320 (a)(4) (i)	IEP-6 §300. 320(a)(6) (ii)(A)(B)	IEP-7 §300.324 (b)(1)(i)	IEP-8 §300. 320 (3)(i) (ii)	IEP-9 §300. 106(a)	IEP-10 §300. 324(a) (4)(6)

COMPONENT D: LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT

Understanding Least Restrictive Environment (LRE):

Under 34 CFR §300.114 and State Board Policy Chapter 74, Rule 74.19, "to the maximum extent appropriate," students with disabilities, including students in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled; and special classes or separate schooling for children with disabilities or their removal from the general education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that education in general education classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

IDEA also requires that schools provide a full continuum of placements, ranging from general education classrooms with support to special classes and special school placements, as needed. The IEP committee is responsible for determining the most appropriate educational placement in the least restrictive environment that can meet the student's educational needs.

The purpose of this section is to ensure placement decisions are individualized in accordance with IDEA regulations and to determine if a relationship exists between placement decisions and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Instructions for the LRE Review:

The review for LRE should follow the steps below:

1. Identify which team members will conduct the LRE review.
2. Complete the LRE review for each student file.
3. Record the responses on the LRE score sheet.
4. Transfer the results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA identifies potential noncompliance with a standard, include a plan for correction on the Results Summary form.
6. Collect and organize required and supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (LRE)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: LRE-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.116(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does documentation demonstrate that the student's placement was: ☐ determined annually, at a minimum, ☐ based on the student's IEP, and ☐ as close as possible to the student's home, and resulted in the student being educated in the school that he or she would attend if nondisabled, unless the IEP requires another arrangement? Notes: • The IEP must address each component to mark YES. • Special factors or justifications requiring a more restrictive placement decision may be considered as evidence of compliance as long as there is evidence that the above factors were considered.	• Policies and procedures • IEP • Special considerations • Other relevant information used to make placement decisions during the IEP process

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** Placement decisions are made in conformity with LRE provisions.	☐ **NO** Placement decisions are not made in conformity with LRE provisions.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: LRE-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(a)(6)(i)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP include relevant accommodations that enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum?	• Policies and procedures • IEP • Evaluation results • Accommodations • Statements of specifically designed instruction • List of accommodations provided to teacher(s) • Classroom observation notes
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	

☐ **YES** The IEP identifies accommodations to be provided to the student.	☐ **NO** Accommodations were included in the IEP, but there is no evidence of implementation.	☐ **NOT APPLICABLE** The IEP committee determined the child does not require accommodations.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: LRE-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.324(a)(2)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP address special factors such as: ☐ language needs of the student; ☐ communication needs of the student; ☐ reading and writing media for students who may need instruction in an alternate format such as Braille or enlarged print; and ☐ assistive technology devices and services?	• IEP • Consideration of special factors • General student information • Evaluation recommendations • Assistive technology • Alternate format • Accommodations • IEP supports/services
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The IEP shows evidence of consideration of special factors as defined under 34 CFR §300.320(a)(2).	☐ **NO** The IEP did not consider any special factors.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: LRE-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §§300.320(a)(5) & 300.116(d)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP team consider all placement options and related services in conjunction with discussing any needed supplementary aids and services, accommodations/ modifications, assistive technology and/or accessible materials, and supports for school personnel as well as potential harmful effects on the student? The IEP team also considered the potential harmful effects of the placement of the child and whether it would impede the ability of the child or other children to learn.	• IEP Form, Placement Considerations and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Determination Optional: • Consideration of special factors • General student information • Evaluation recommendations • Assistive technology assessment • Accommodations • IEP supports/services
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** For a student not educated or served in the general education setting, the IEP includes justification for why the student's placement is not the general education classroom and: • Is based on the needs of the student; • Reflects that the committee has given adequate consideration to meeting the student's needs in the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services; and • If the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general education classes, even with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily, a justification is given for the decision.	☐ **NO** Rationale is not given, or the rationale given: • Is not based on the student's needs; • Does not reflect consideration or the provision of supplementary aids and services in the general education classroom; and • Does not describe potential harmful effects to the student or others, if applicable.

Group Discussion Questions:
- Are IEP committees, to the maximum extent possible, placing students in settings with age-appropriate peers?
- Are teachers implementing accommodations as recommended by the IEP committee?
- Are IEP committees making special considerations for students that may require instruction supported by an alternate format or assistive technology?
- What barriers, if any, exist related to students receiving appropriate supplemental aids and support in the general education classroom setting?

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT D – LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (LRE) – SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if no evidence was found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Student Number	LRE-1 §300.116(b)	LRE-2 §300.320(a)(6)(i)	LRE-3 §300.320(a)(4)	LRE-4 §300.320(a)(5)

COMPONENT E: SECONDARY TRANSITION E: SECONDARY TRANSITION *(REQUIRED FOR STUDENTS 14 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER ONLY)*

Understanding the Secondary Transition (TRAN):

Secondary Transition components include "appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment; transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Committee meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of

any participating agency was invited to the IEP Committee meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority." (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Federal requirements are also measured through Indicator 13 of Mississippi's SPP. This secondary transition review provides the opportunity for LEAs to examine transition procedures for students with disabilities that are aged 14 or older.

Instructions for the Review:

The Secondary Transition review process includes the steps below:

1. Identify a team member who is knowledgeable about secondary transition procedures for students with disabilities.
2. Complete the Secondary Transition review for each student file for a student age 14 or older.
3. Record the responses on the Secondary Transition score sheet.
4. Transfer results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA was found noncompliant, develop a plan of correction which includes timelines for implementation.
6. Collect and organize supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

COMPONENT E – SECONDARY TRANSITION (TRAN)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Are there appropriate measurable postsecondary goals addressing education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?	• IEP • Transition page of IEP • Transition folder/binder
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The required postsecondary goals are present, measurable, and will occur after high school.	☐ **NO** Goals are not present, measurable, and/or do not state what the student will do after high school.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on an age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?	• IEP • Copy of Transition assessment(s)
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The use of a transition assessment(s) for the development of postsecondary goals is evident in the IEP.	☐ **NO** There is no evidence of a transition assessment(s) OR transition assessments were not used to develop postsecondary goals.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Are there transition services/activities in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goals?	• IEP • Transition page of IEP
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	

☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**
There is at least one transition service/activity documented in the IEP associated with meeting each of the postsecondary goals.	There are no transition services/activities documented in the IEP associated with meeting each of the postsecondary goals.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(b)(2)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Do transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goals?	• IEP Transition page • IEP • Report cards • Student transcript
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**
Transition services include a course of study that aligns with the student's postsecondary goals.	Transition services do not include a course of study that aligns with the student's postsecondary goals.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-5 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.321(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the student with a disability participate in the IEP committee meeting with the purpose of providing input and/or considerations for the development of postsecondary goals? If not, is there evidence that the student was invited to participate in the IEP committee meeting with the purpose of providing input and/or considerations for the development of postsecondary goals?	• IEP • Transition page of IEP • IEP goal page(s) • Notice of Committee Meeting to student

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** There is documentation that the student participated in the IEP committee meeting and provided input and/or considerations toward the development of his/her postsecondary goals. **OR** There is documentation that the student was invited to participate in the IEP committee meeting with the purpose of providing input and/or considerations for the development of postsecondary goals.	☐ **NO** There is no documented evidence that the student was invited to or participated in the IEP committee meeting or provided input and/or considerations toward the development of his/her postsecondary goals.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-6 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.321(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Is there evidence that a representative of an applicable participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP committee meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority, if appropriate?	• PWN • Age of Majority letter (if applicable) • Notice of Committee Meeting to agency representative

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION		
☐ **YES** There is appropriate documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student. **OR** There is documentation that representatives of agencies were invited, but parent did not give consent for agency representatives to attend the meeting.	☐ **NO** There is no documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student.	☐ **NA** IEP Committee determined that linkage to an outside agency and participation is not applicable.

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT E – SECONDARY TRANSITION (TRAN) – SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if evidence was not found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Student Number	TRAN-1 §300.320	TRAN-2 §300.320	TRAN-3 §300.320	TRAN-4 §300.320	TRAN-5 §300.321	TRAN-6 §300.321

COMPONENT F: EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION

Understanding the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE):

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Section 619 is intended to help states ensure that all preschool-aged children (3 through 5 years of age) with disabilities receive special education and related services.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services are designed for young children with disabilities, beginning at age 3, who need specially designed instruction or related services and whose disability(ies) cause the children to be unable to participate in developmentally appropriate typical preschool activities. Educators, along with the child's family, develop an IEP with goals and objectives to meet the child's developmental needs. The goals and objectives include a variety of skills and/or activities for the child to learn and use consistently. School districts are required by law to ensure that developmentally appropriate ECSE programs and services are available to all eligible children with disabilities. ECSE programs and services ensure that all children with disabilities have a FAPE that is designed to meet their unique needs and enable them to make progress in acquiring knowledge and skills, improving social relationships, and taking action to meet their needs within the general education program.

A young child who is deemed eligible for special education receives services in the LRE, which can include his/her home, a childcare or preschool setting, or a Head Start program or public school, as determined by the child's IEP Committee. Services are provided at no cost to families through ECSE programs in LEAs throughout Mississippi, including charter schools. Processes for referral for evaluation and determination of eligibility are the same as those for older, school-aged children with disabilities.

Instructions for the Review:

The ECSE review process includes the steps below:

1. Identify a team member who is knowledgeable about early childhood special education procedures for students with disabilities ages 3 through 5.
2. Complete the ECSE review for each student file where the student is ages 3 through 5.
3. Record the responses on the ECSE score sheet.
4. Transfer results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA was found noncompliant, develop a plan of correction which includes timelines for implementation.
6. Collect and organize supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

COMPONENT F – EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION (ECSE)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: ECSE-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.321(a)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the ECSE IEP Committee include the parent and the appropriate personnel that will be providing services to the student?	• PWN listing IEP participants • IEP signature page

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The parent and appropriate personnel providing services were present at the IEP committee meeting.	☐ **NO** The parent and/or appropriate personnel providing services were not present at the IEP team meeting.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: ECSE-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.124(c)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did an LEA representative participate in the transition conference arranged with the early intervention program for a preschooler who was transitioning from an early intervention program?	• PWN • IEP signature page • Conference summary with LEA representative's signature
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** An LEA representative attended the transition conference to develop an IEP.	☐ **NO** An LEA representative did not attend the transition conference to develop an IEP.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: ECSE-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.124 AND 300.101(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
For preschoolers transitioning from an early intervention program (Part C), was the IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday?	• PWN • IEP • Documentation of transition conference notes
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	

☐ **YES** The IEP was developed and implemented by the child's third birthday.	☐ **NO** The IEP was not developed and implemented by the child's third birthday.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: ECSE-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.323(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
For preschoolers transitioning from Part C, was the Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) considered in developing the IEP?	• Copy of IFSP • Copy of IEP • Teacher anecdotal notes • Agency representative anecdotal notes • Other teacher/agency documentation on student progress
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** There is evidence the IFSP was considered in developing the IEP.	☐ **NO** There was no evidence the IFSP was considered in developing the IEP.

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT F – EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION (ECSE) – SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Early Childhood (EC) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if evidence was not found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Student Number	ECSE-1 §300.321	ECSE-2 §300.124	ECSE-3 §300.124	ECSE-4 §300.323

COMPONENT G: DISCIPLINE

Understanding the Discipline (DIS):

For disciplinary actions resulting in the removal of students for more than ten (10) days in a school year (whether or not the days are consecutive), the school must provide special education services that allow the student to:

- continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting; and
- progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the student's IEP.

If the disciplinary action results in a removal from school that is a change of placement, the IEP committee must determine the exact educational services needed while the student is assigned to the interim alternative education setting, another setting, or suspension.

Within 10 days from the beginning of a disciplinary action that results in a removal that exceeds 10 school days, the school district, parents, and relevant members of the student's IEP committee must meet to determine if the conduct in question was caused by, or had a direct and substantial relationship to, the student's disability. Please note that 10 school days can be consecutive days or a pattern or removal that totals 10 days and therefore constitutes a change in placement.

The committee must also determine if the conduct was the direct result of the school's failure to implement the student's IEP, including a behavior intervention plan. If the IEP committee decides that the student's behavior was a direct result of the school's failure to implement the IEP, the school must take immediate steps to remedy the deficiencies and return the student to his/her original placement.

Indicator 4 of Mississippi's SPP reports on the rate of removals greater than 10 days. LEAs that do not meet state targets are required to assess discipline-related polices, practices, and procedures for students with disabilities. This discipline review provides the opportunity for LEAs to examine discipline procedures for students who have been removed for more than 10 days in a school year.

Instructions for the Review:

The Discipline review process includes the steps below:

1. Identify a team member who is knowledgeable about discipline procedures for students with disabilities.
2. Complete the Discipline review for each student file for a student who was suspended or

expelled for 10 or more days.

3. Record the responses on the Discipline score sheet.
4. Transfer results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA was found noncompliant, develop a plan for correction which includes timelines for implementation.
6. Collect and organize supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

COMPONENT G – DISCIPLINE (DIS)

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-1 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(h)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the LEA notify the parents of a removal that constituted a change of placement (10 school days) due to a violation of a code of conduct by the student on the date on which the decision was made and did the LEA provide the parents with a copy of the procedural safeguards?	• IEP • Notice of Committee Meeting • PWN
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	

☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**
There is documentation the parent was notified on the same date of the removal and was provided with a notice of procedural safeguards.	There is no documentation the parent was notified on the same date of removal and was not provided a copy of the procedural safeguards notice (if the parent was notified on same date but did not receive procedural safeguards, this is still noncompliant).

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-2 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(e)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Was the Manifestation Determination Review (MDR) conducted within 10 school days of the LEA's decision to change the placement of a child with a disability for disciplinary reasons? (When a student is removed for more than 10 consecutive days, or for less time if there have been multiple removals for less than 10 days at a time where the removals constitute a change in placement.)	• Student discipline records • Documentation of out-of-school suspensions and/or expulsions • Manifestation determination • Other discipline-related resources

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The date of the MDR is not more than ten (10) school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of a student with a disability through a school suspension or expulsion.	☐ **NO** The date of the MDR is more than ten (10) school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of the student with a disability through a suspension or expulsion. **Special Circumstances:** School personnel may remove a student to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than forty-five (45) school days without regard to whether the behavior is determined to be a manifestation of the student's disability for possession of a weapon, use of illegal drugs, or infliction of serious bodily injury.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-3 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(f)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the LEA conduct a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) after determination by the LEA, the parent, and relevant team members that the conduct was a manifestation of the student's disability? (Unless the LEA conducted the FBA before the behavior that resulted in the change of placement.)	• FBA

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES*** ☐ An FBA was conducted, if required. ☐ An FBA is included in the student's file. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **NO*** ☐ No evidence of an FBA is available in the student's file. ☐ An FBA was conducted, but it does not meet the requirements. *Either of the above may indicate noncompliance.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(f)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the LEA develop a Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) for the student as a result of the FBA? OR If the BIP had already been developed, did the LEA review the BIP after the manifestation determination and modify it as necessary to address the student's behavior?	• BIP

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES*** ☐ A BIP is included in the student's file. ☐ The BIP addresses relevant behaviors. ☐ The BIP was modified to address student behavior(s). *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ **NO*** ☐ A BIP is not included in the student's file. ☐ A BIP is included, but it does not address current behavior. ☐ A BIP was not modified to address the student's behavior(s). *Any of the above may indicate noncompliance.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-5 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(d)(4)&(5)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
After the removal, was the student able to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the student's IEP?	- IEP - Progress reports - Service logs - Work samples - Teacher notes - Observations and interviews

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES** The student file demonstrates evidence that during the time of the removal, the student: - had access to the general education curriculum; and - continued to progress toward meeting goals.	☐ **NO** The student file did not reveal evidence of continued participation in the general education curriculum and progress toward IEP goals after the removal.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: DIS-6 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.530(b)(2) AND §300.530 (d)(1)(i)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the student receive special education and related services beginning on the 11th day of suspension that allowed them to continue to access and make progress in the general education curriculum?	- Copy of MDR form - IEP - School attendance record - Disciplinary action documentation

EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**
The student continued to receive special education and related services beginning on the 11th day of suspension/removal in their regular school setting, home-school setting, or alternative school site.	The student did not receive special education and related services beginning on the 11th day of suspension/removal (student did not receive any educational services beginning on the 11th day of suspension).

Group Discussion Questions:

- Which schools in the LEA have the greatest number of removals?
- Did the team notice any patterns that exist with regard to removals (e.g., disproportionality, higher rates at particular school sites, specific grade levels, etc.)?
- For any student removed for greater than 10 days in a school year, were the appropriate procedures followed before and after the student was removed to an interim alternative educational placement, another setting, or received suspension?
- Were special education and related services provided in the above instance?
- Was the team able to identify a relationship between discipline removals and performance on statewide assessments?
- For students exhibiting a pattern of challenging behaviors, were positive behavioral interventions offered to address those behaviors? If an FBA and BIP were developed to address challenging behaviors, were they revised if a decline in those behaviors occurred? If necessary, were they revised to address new behaviors?
- What are the appropriate interventions to correct any issues which exist?

AGENCY SELF-MONITORING FILE REVIEW COMPONENT G – DISCIPLINE (DIS) – SCORE SHEET

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

Elementary (E) School Students	Middle (M) School Students	High School (H) Students	Out of District Placements*	Grand Record Total

*This includes students placed by the LEA in Educable Child Facilities, University-Based Programs, etc.

Instructions: List MSIS codes of the targeted sample of student files. Enter "Yes" if evidence was found. Enter "No" if evidence was not found. Enter "NA" if the item is not applicable to the selected student. No item may be left blank.

Student Number	DIS-1 §300.530(h)	DIS-2 §300.530(e)	DIS-3 §300.530(f)	DIS-4 §300.530(f)	DIS-5 §300.530(d)(4)&(5)	DIS-6 §300.530(b)(2)& §300.530(d)(1)(i)

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY SELF-MONITORING RESULTS SUMMARY FORM

Instructions: The Results Summary Report must be completed and submitted to MDE OSE according to the schedule included in this document. This form should be used by the self-assessment team to compile information recorded on the self-assessment score sheets. Below are specific instructions for documenting and addressing compliance issues for each of the self-assessment standards.

FAPE and CF
Indicate whether the LEA found evidence of implementation for each Child Find standard by checking the column next to the appropriate standard. For any "No" response, a plan of improvement is recommended, including the following components: action steps for improvement, personnel responsible, timeline, and expected outcomes.

IEP, LRE, TRAN, ECSE, and DIS
Indicate the total number of files reviewed for each standard for IEP, LRE, TRAN, ECSE, and DIS.

Enter the number of "Yes" files, the number of "No" files, the number of "NA" files, and enter the percent "Yes." For any "No" response, a plan of improvement is recommended, including the following components: action steps for improvement, personnel responsible, timeline, and expected outcomes.

To determine the percent compliant, divide "Number Yes + NA" by "Total Records Reviewed" (Number Yes + NA/Total Records Reviewed).

COMPONENT A – FAPE				
Date Completed:				
FAPE	Yes	No	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
FAPE-1				§300.101(1)(b)
FAPE-2				§300.308
FAPE-3				§300.301
FAPE-4				§300.301 & 300.102

COMPONENT B – CHILD FIND				
Date Completed:				
Child Find	Yes	No	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
CF-1				§300.111(a)(c)
CF-2				§300.301
CFR-1				§300.303(1)(2)

COMPONENT C – INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
IEP-1							§300.322(a)
IEP-2							§300.320 (a)(1)(i)
IEP-3							§300.320 (a)(2)(i)(A)
IEP-4							§300.320 (a)(4)(7)
IEP-5							§300.320 (a)(4)(i)
IEP-6							§300.320 (a) (6)(ii)(A)(B)
IEP-7							§300.324 (b)(1)(i)
IEP-8							§300.320 (3)(i)(ii)
IEP-9							§300.16 (a)
IEP-10							§300.324 (a)(4)(6)

COMPONENT D – LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (LRE)							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
LRE-1							§300.116(b)
LRE-2							§300.320 (a)(6)(i)
LRE-3							§300.320 (a)(4)
LRE-4							§§300.320(a)(5) & 300.116(d)

COMPONENT E – SECONDARY TRANSITION							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation

TRAN-1							§300.320
TRAN-2							§300.320
TRAN-3							§300.320
TRAN-4							§300.320
TRAN-5							§300.321
TRAN-6							§300.321

COMPONENT F – EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION (ECSE)							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
ECSE-1							§300.321
ECSE-2							§300.124
ECSE-3							§300.124
ECSE-4							§300.323

Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
COMPONENT G – DISCIPLINE							
Date Completed:							
DIS-1							§300.530(h)
DIS-2							§300.530(e)
DIS-3							§300.530(f)
DIS-4							§300.530(f)
DIS-5							§300.530(d) (4–5)
DIS-6							§§300.530 (b)(2) & 300.530 (d)(i)

Appendix D: Risk-Based Assessment Rubric

Indicator	Scoring
Were any schools in the district identified as a Targeted Support and Improvement School (TSI)?	No schools were identified within the LEA: 0 At least one school in the LEA has been identified as TSI: 3 At least one school in the LEA has been identified as TSI for Students with Disabilities: 5
Were any schools in the district identified as an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement School (ATSI)?	No schools were identified within the LEA: 0 At least one school in the LEA has been identified as ATSI: 5 At least one school in the LEA has been identified as ATSI for Students with Disabilities: 10
Did the LEA meet requirements for its Special Education Performance Determination Report? Most recent data available.	Needs assistance (3+ years): 5 Needs intervention (3+ years): 10 Needs substantial intervention: 15
Did the LEA resolve findings from parent complaints within timelines?	0 unresolved complaints: 0 1 unresolved complaint: 5 2 unresolved complaints: 8 3 or more unresolved complaints: 10
Did the LEA meet state targets for SPED compliance indicators (11, 12, and 13)? Most recent data available.	LEA does not meet requirements for 1 indicator: 3 LEA does not meet requirements for 2 indicators: 6 LEA does not meet requirements for 3 or more indicators: 8 Has long standing noncompliance for one or more indicators (more than 1 year without correction): 10
Did the LEA have unresolved monitoring findings for more than 1 year based on most recent monitoring data? Includes all monitoring activities.	No - 0 Yes - 10
Has the LEA been identified as having significant disproportionality?	No - 0 Yes - 10
Has the LEA Special Education Director been in the position for three years or less?	Yes - 5 No - 0

Appendix E: Intensive Monitoring Protocol

The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education (MDE OSE) conducts Intensive Monitoring as part of its Comprehensive Monitoring system. The monitoring system prioritizes areas for review based on:

- findings of noncompliance, areas at risk for noncompliance, and areas with lack of improvement determined through the state's risk assessment, including:
  - findings of noncompliance based on local educational agency (LEA) data for the federal annual performance report (APR) compliance indicators[2] 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;
  - failure to meet state targets or show improvement toward the target for consecutive years on APR indicators 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14;
  - submission of timely, valid and reliable data.
- findings of noncompliance identified in the LEA's self-assessment; and
- other information available to MDE indicating the need for on-site monitoring.

The purpose of Intensive Monitoring is to determine compliance with federal and state laws for serving students with disabilities, to direct the provision of technical assistance from the state educational agency (SEA) to the LEA, and to assist the LEA in developing a continuous improvement process.

The process includes multiple activities that are initiated within a school year:

- Pre–On-Site Activities
- On-Site Review Activities
- Post–On-Site Activities

A table summarizing monitoring activities is included for reference.

Pre–On-Site Activities
Pre–on-site activities include the data review, establishing an LEA team, and an MDE OSE/ LEA pre–on-site meeting.

Data Review
The purpose of the data review is to identify trends or patterns which may point to an area(s) of concern (placement, performance, disability categories, discipline, significant disproportionality, etc.) to inform the focus of the on-site visit and determine:

- Student records selected for review and rationale for selection
- Questions for interviews and who will be interviewed
- Other activities or documents including policies and procedures to be reviewed
- Further actions needed by the LEA

---

[2] The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires each state to evaluate each LEA's performance against the indicators in the state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR). Those indicators are: 1. Graduation rates; 2. Dropout rates; 3. Participation and performance on statewide assessments; 4. Suspension and expulsion rates; 5. Education environments; 6. Preschool environments; 7. Preschool outcomes; 8. Parent involvement; 9. Disproportionate representation in special education and related services; 10. Disproportionate representation in specific disability categories; 11. Child find; 12. Early childhood transition; 13. Secondary transition; 14. Post-school outcomes; 15. Resolution sessions; 16. Mediation; 17. State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

APR Indicator Data

The MDE OSE reviews current and historical APR compliance and results indicator data submitted by each LEA to identify possible focus areas for the on-site visit—specifically, any findings of noncompliance or historical data indicating multiple years of data correction.

LEA Self-Assessment Data

The MDE OSE reviews results from the LEA self-assessment, including any potential noncompliance and associated improvement plans. There are six components of the self-assessment process: Child Find, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Individualized Education Program (IEP), Discipline, Secondary Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE).

Risk-Based Assessment

The MDE OSE uses its annual risk assessment to inform additional priority areas for the on-site visit. Risk analysis is based upon multiple factors and measures associated with compliance and outcomes data, results from the LEA's self-assessment, as well as additional data including but not limited to the LEA's accreditation status, unresolved parent complaints, findings related to FAPE, and historically meeting timelines for correcting noncompliance.

Establishing an LEA Team

The LEA identifies specific staff to serve on the LEA team. Roles include participating in pre- and post–on-site meetings, compiling student files, responding to questions, and participating in on-site activities as necessary.

Team member selection is at the discretion of the LEA; however, MDE OSE recommends including knowledgeable and experienced individuals such as the LEA Special Education Director, general education teachers, special education teachers, case managers, behavior interventionists, related service providers, and building administrators. Please note that every member of the LEA team may not need to participate in all monitoring activities.

MDE OSE/LEA Pre–On-Site Meeting

Prior to an on-site visit, the MDE OSE assigns a Program Monitoring Specialist to serve as the LEA's point of contact throughout the on-site monitoring cycle. Monitoring the implementation of corrective action plans and providing differentiated technical assistance to best support the LEA's needs may be provided by the Program Monitoring Specialist or other MDE OSE program monitoring staff. Depending upon the size and scope of monitoring activities, MDE OSE may also assign a program monitoring team to participate in activities. The MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist conducts a pre–on-site visit meeting with designated members of the LEA team. The pre–on-site meeting is used to provide an overview of the prioritized target areas for the monitoring visit, address questions from the LEA in preparation for the monitoring visit, review the on-site monitoring protocol, and facilitate information gathering necessary to assist the on-site visit, including:

- Student records selected for review during the on-site monitoring visit and corresponding student schedules. These files must be different from the files selected for the self-assessment.
- Updates to LEA self-assessment data, including evidence of activities completed to address areas of improvement identified by the self-assessment activities and new evidence to review in relation to the standards.
- Pertinent policy and procedures.
- Special education staff/personnel roster including titles, years of services and work hours.

Prior to an on-site visit, the LEA will address logistical considerations to ensure a smooth on-site visit. These considerations may include making arrangements for a work area with adequate table space for the monitoring team and making a computer, printer, and other technical supports and supplies available during monitoring.

On-Site Activities

The MDE OSE on-site visit consists of student file reviews for specific areas of interest as informed by the compliance and results indicator data analysis and LEA self-assessment, interviews with LEA staff, and, when indicated by the data, select parents, teacher, and/or student interview or focus groups, classroom observations, and a review of selected internal policies and procedures. On-site activities will be differentiated by the results of the risk assessment and LEA self-assessment and other available information, including but not limited to noncompliance identified in due process, formal state complaints, accreditation status, and LEA determinations.

Student File Reviews

MDE OSE, with the LEA team, will review and score student files using selected areas of the Student File Review Form based on the Pre–On-site Activities. The LEA team will be responsible for creating a sample of files consistent with the On-Site Monitoring File Sample Selection protocol and matrices that reasonably represent the LEA's population of students with disabilities. These files must be different from the files reviewed for the Self-Assessment. Files must be scored according to the Instructions for On-Site Compliance Scoring and Summary Documentation. Based on the results of the Self-Assessment and other data reviewed, MDE OSE may require additional specific files to be included in the sample for review. The LEA will provide MDE OSE with a list of the selected files, including noting which files meet specific criteria.

Interviews and Focus Groups

The purposes of interviews and focus groups are to learn more about the LEA's processes and procedures, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and to identify potential root causes of noncompliance. The selection of interview and focus group participants and questions is informed by the pre–on-site meeting and on-site activities. A sample of potential questions is included in the interviews and focus groups protocol. Interview and focus group data are used to inform the Monitoring Report and future technical assistance.

Classroom Observations

MDE OSE and the LEA team will conduct classroom observations to verify the results of the student file reviews and Pre–On-Site data reviews, verify that students are receiving the special education and related services on their IEPs in the LRE, and observe any promising practices occurring in schools.

Policy and Procedure Review

In addition to reviewing student-level data, MDE OSE completes a targeted review of the LEA's policies and procedures for compliance with IDEA and to identify areas for improvement. This review is informed by results from the LEA's risk assessment, self-assessment, and other on-site monitoring activities. The purpose of the review is to identify areas for improvement in the LEA's system or infrastructure, including policies and procedures, that may be contributing to noncompliance. Based upon the results of its review, MDE OSE may make suggestions or require LEAs to submit updated policies and procedures to strengthen internal controls and implementation.

Exit Meeting

The MDE OSE conducts an exit meeting with LEA's designated staff at the conclusion of the on-site visit. The purpose of the exit meeting is to address the following:

- A general summary of preliminary review results.
- Additional documentation or data needed for review, as required.
- An explanation of MDE OSE's monitoring report and timelines for post–on-site activities.

Post–On-Site Activities

Monitoring Report

Within 90 days of the on-site visit, a comprehensive monitoring report, including any findings of noncompliance, is sent to the LEA. All monitoring reports are sent by email to verify receipt, and a hard copy is sent by mail. The report states the objectives, scope, and methodology of the monitoring and clearly outlines findings, required corrective actions, and areas and recommendations for improvement. Findings contain a statement of criteria applied (regulation, directive, contract clause, etc.), the condition found or reason for the finding of noncompliance, required corrective actions, and evidence for verification of correction. Each finding of noncompliance must be corrected in a timely manner, but not more than 12 months from receipt of the monitoring report, by the LEA submitting data to demonstrate correction of individual instances of noncompliance and subsequent data demonstrating ongoing compliance. Depending on the extent of noncompliance, LEAs may also be required to submit a detailed improvement plan, including specific steps to be taken with an associated timeline, implement internal controls, and submit regular reports documenting progress toward compliance.

MDE OSE is responsible for ensuring and verifying correction of noncompliance and improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Potential MDE OSE incentive and enforcement options available to use with the LEA include:

- Providing technical assistance tailored to address an LEA's specific area(s) of need.
- Decreasing LEA reporting requirements when noncompliance is corrected in a shorter timeline or increasing reporting requirements when noncompliance is not corrected.
- Recognizing improvement and timely correction through determinations or risk assessment scores (higher determinations and decreased risk).
- Ensuring LEA determination or risk assessment scores reflect missed corrective action plan timelines and milestones (lower determinations and increased risk).
- Conducting additional on-site monitoring.
- Imposing special conditions on the LEA's IDEA subgrant award(s).
- Directing the use of or withholding IDEA funds.
- Referring the LEA for accreditation actions and sanctions.
- Referring the LEA for state takeover with state oversight.

Technical Assistance

Based on the results of each monitoring visit, the MDE OSE provides differentiated technical assistance and supports targeting any areas of noncompliance, identified areas for improvement, or recommendations for changes or additions to LEA policies and procedures.

Summary of Monitoring Activities

Required Activity	Recommendations and Action Steps
1. Pre–On-Site Activities	• The LEA is notified of upcoming on-site monitoring activities. • The LEA selects a team. • The MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist and designated members of the LEA team participate in a pre–on-site visit meeting. • The LEA team designates a secure space for monitoring activities. • The LEA team identifies student files to review. Refer to the sample selection instructions.
2. On-Site Activities	• The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams review files for target areas identified by MDE OSE. • The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams complete interviews, classroom observations, and review target area policies and procedures. • The MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams summarize what they learned and observed with the LEA. • The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams discuss levels of compliance and performance in target areas.
3. Post–On-Site Activities	• The MDE OSE Program Monitoring team sends the Monitoring Report no later than 90 days from the completion of the on-site activities. • The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). • The LEA team and MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist schedule at least three (3) follow-up meetings during the course of correction. One of these meetings is specifically to review immediate or short-term corrective action items. • The LEA has one calendar year from receipt of the Monitoring Report to correct all individual instances of noncompliance and provide subsequent data demonstrating ongoing compliance, as defined in the Monitoring Report. • The MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist verifies correction by reviewing samples of corrected files and subsequent files to ensure systemic correction and sustainability within one year of the Monitoring Report. • The MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist reviews the CAP for completion of CAP activities. This may require the LEA to produce evidence of trainings provided, training materials, agendas, etc.

Instructions for On-Site Compliance Scoring and Summary Documentation

For all on-site file review forms and worksheets, the MDE OSE Monitoring team assesses each factor and indicates "Yes" for In Compliance, "No" for Out of Compliance, and "NA" for those items that do not apply. "NA" should only be used if a standard does not apply to a particular situation. It may not be used as an alternative for not fully implementing a standard.

The steps for developing the final reports are listed below:

1. Each individual line item for required sections must be reviewed and assessed. Select Yes, No, or NA on the corresponding line for each item on the form.

2. Once the forms and worksheets have been completed, the data are entered into the monitoring form by the MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist. MDE OSE calculates the compliance level for each line item by summarizing the data that was collected from all sources.

3. Together, the LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring team members review each of the identified target areas within the monitoring form.

4. Based upon the review of all data, the MDE OSE Program Monitoring team determines the level of compliance of the LEA in each of the identified target areas. There are three options for each section: Compliant, Isolated Incidences of Noncompliance, or Systemic Noncompliance. Each incidence of noncompliance must be corrected, whether isolated or systemic.

5. The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams reach agreement on the areas of strength and concern based upon all data gathered. The strengths and concerns related to the special education program are documented in the Monitoring Report sent to the LEA after monitoring activities are completed.

6. The final Monitoring Report informs the development of a CAP and subsequent technical assistance, as needed. The LEA team, in collaboration with the MDE OSE Program Monitoring Specialist, develops a CAP so that it is meaningful to the LEA and clearly outlines the activities and requirements necessary for the correction of noncompliance and the attainment of sustainability. Depending on the level of noncompliance, MDE OSE will require the CAP to clearly identify the reason the noncompliance occurred, consider solutions for the LEA to correct the systems, and suggest internal verification the LEA can implement to ensure sustainability.

LEA: _____

Number of students in special education (child count)	10 or Less	11–100	101–250	251–500	501 or more
Number of eligible student files to be reviewed	All	20	30	40	55+

The sample files selected should be a reasonable representation of students with disabilities served within the LEA. These files must be different from the files reviewed for the Self-Assessment. Based on the results of the Self-Assessment and other data reviewed, MDE OSE may require additional specific files to be included in the sample.

Selection Criteria:

The sample **must** include the following if available in the LEA (one student file may meet multiple criteria):

- students with an initial evaluation and placement in the past year (10% of sample);
- students who were reevaluated in the past year (10% of sample);
- students who turned 3 during the past year (10% of sample);
- students age 14 and older on both the regular and alternate diploma tracks (10% of sample);
- students who participated in the alternate assessment (at least one file);
- if the LEA was identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion rates (Indicator 4a), students who were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days (10% of sample); and
- if the LEA was identified as having significant disproportionality, at least one student from each race/ethnicity group and area of disproportionality identified.

The sample **should** also include, to the extent possible:

- students placed in all settings used by the LEA;
- students from different disability categories; and
- students with a range of age and grade levels, including students ages 3 through 5.

If the LEA wants to further explore the impact of compliance on outcomes for students with disabilities, the sample **may** include:

- students attending each school in the LEA (if all schools are not represented, include students from schools with both low and high rates of placement in the general education settings and both low and high assessment scores for students with disabilities);
- students failing two or more core subjects;
- students that have repeated a grade; and
- students attending schools with the highest percentage of discipline removals (both in school and out of school) of greater than ten (10) days in a school year.

The following matrix may be used to assist you in determining the sample to be selected for monitoring:

Service Delivery Options	Mississippi Eligibility Categories[3]											
	AU	DB	DD	EmD	HI	ID	MD	OI	OHI	SLD	TBI	VI
Included in general education classroom 80% or more of the school day (SC-A)												
Included in general education classroom between 40% and 79% of the school day (SC-B)												
Included in general education classroom for less than 40% of the school day (SC-C)												
LEA-operated special school (SC-D)												
Private day school (SC-D)												
Private residential facilities (SC-E, EA, EB, or EC)												
Homebound/hospital/institutional settings (SC-H)												
Preschool – Included in general education classroom (PI, PK)												
Preschool – Served in a separate special education classroom (PJ, PL, PG)												
Preschool – Served in a separate school (PF)												
Preschool – Served in a residential facility (PE)												
Preschool – Served in home or service provider location (PC, PH)												

---

[3] For a complete list of Mississippi eligibility categories, please visit MDE OSE's Procedures for State Board Policy 74.19, Volume I: https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/documents/vol-i-cf-eval-elig-final-volume-09-22-2015_20160708142156_277140.pdf.

Monitoring File Sample

LEA: _____   Date of Review: _____

List all student files and indicate the purpose of review for each file selected.

Student Last Name, First Initial	DOB	School or Teacher	Eligibility Category	Initial Eval	Reevaluation	Pre-K	English Language Learner (ELL)	Dropout Recovery Program (DRP)	Approved Private Day	Secondary Transition	Dismissals	Suspended /Expelled	Reviewer Signature or Initials
MSIS 1.													
MSIS 2.													
MSIS 3.													
MSIS 4.													
MSIS 5.													
MSIS 6.													
MSIS 7.													
MSIS 8.													
MSIS 9.													
MSIS 10.													

Student File Review Form

Instructions: Depending on the Pre–On-Site activities, specific sections of this protocol are used to review files. Some areas are used across all students and some may not apply to all selected students (e.g., discipline). All selected sections are completed for each file unless the section does not apply. For example, if a student was selected because they are over age 14, the IEP and other sections will still be reviewed, not only the Secondary Transition section.

Complete one form for each selected file. Mark **Yes** if there is evidence in the file the standard was met, and **No** if there is no evidence the standard was met. **NA** should only be marked if the requirements do not apply to the student (e.g., if the student's age precludes them from needing a transition plan).

Student:	DOB:	MSIS Code:___	Eligibility:
Ethnicity:	School:	Monitor:	Date of Review:

Evaluation, Reevaluation, & Eligibility (use the most recent eligibility determination in the student's file)					
	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
Parental consent was obtained prior to conducting an initial evaluation or prior to conducting a reevaluation. §300.300(a) and §300.300(c)					- Evaluation reports - Referral documentation - Notice for Reevaluation – No Additional Assessment Requested - Notice for Reevaluation – Additional Assessment Requested - Prior Written Notice - Parental requests and consent - Parental complaints
The LEA provides notice to the parents that describes any evaluation procedures the LEA proposed to conduct. §300.304(a)					- Evaluation reports - Referral documentation - Notice for Reevaluation – No Additional Assessment Requested

				- Notice for Reevaluation – Additional Assessment Requested - Prior Written Notice - Parental requests and consent - Parental complaints
The initial evaluation was conducted within 60 days of parental consent. §300.301 A reevaluation was conducted within three years of the most recent evaluation. §300.303				- Parental consent forms - Indicator report - Initial evaluation reports - Other relevant sources of information
A variety of assessment tools and strategies (not a single measure or assessment as the sole criterion) were used to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent. §300.304(b)(1) and §300.304(2)				Evaluation reports
For reevaluation, existing data (evaluation data and parental input, current classroom based, local or state assessment data, and observations) from a variety of sources (teacher data, parent data, and related services data) were used to determine continued eligibility. §300.305 and §300.306(c)				- Evaluation results - IEP committee recommendations - Consideration of special factors - Measurable annual goals - Examples of methods of measurement - IEP
Upon completion of the evaluations and assessments, a committee including the parent determined whether the child meets the criteria to be a child with a disability and needs special education and related services because of the disability. §300.306				- Eligibility Determination report - Prior Written Notice
Evaluation and assessment results show the student meets Mississippi's criteria for the				Eligibility Determination report

	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
disability category identified. State Board Policy Chapter 74, Rule 74.19, §300.306(c) and §300.311					• Evaluation reports • Prior Written Notice
If the child was initially determined to be eligible with a ruling of Developmentally Delayed (DD), the public agency conducted a reevaluation prior to the child's 10th birthday. §300.303(a), §300.304, §300.305, §300.306, and Special Education Eligibility Determination Guidelines pp. 303–305					• Eligibility Determination Report • MSIS Screen • IEP Review/Revision Dates • MET/IEP Documentation • Date of Comprehensive Reevaluation Reports

Individualized Education Program (IEP)					
	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
The parents were invited to the IEP committee meeting, and if neither parent was able to attend it, there is documentation of attempts to ensure parental participation. §300.322(a) and §300.501(b)					• Documentation of invitation • Contact logs
The appropriate committee members were present at the IEP committee meeting (signature[s] provided at IEP Committee meeting), and if the appropriate committee members were not present, an excusal form is available for the committee member(s) and the excused committee member provided input. §300.321(a)–(b) and §300.321(a)(7)(e)(1-2)(i-ii)					• IEP – Signature page • Excusal form
The IEP includes a statement of present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. §300.320(a)(1)(i)(2)(i)					• IEP – PLAAFP

The IEP committee considered: • the strengths of the student; • the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child; • the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation; and • the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the student §300.324(a)(1)					• IEP – PLAAFP
The IEP committee considered special factors including: • The use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address the behavior of a student whose behavior impedes his/her learning §300.324(a)(2)(i); • The language needs of a child with limited English proficiency, as those needs relate to the child's IEP §300.324(a)(2)(ii); • The use of Braille in the case of a child who is blind or visually impaired unless the IEP Committee determines, after an evaluation of the child's reading and writing skills, needs, and appropriate reading and writing media (including an evaluation of the child's future needs for instruction in Braille or the use of Braille), that instruction in Braille or the use of Braille is not appropriate for the child §300.324(a)(2)(iii); • The communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who					• IEP – Special considerations

is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communications with peers and professional personnel in the child's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the child's language and communication mode §300.324(a)(2)(iv); and • Whether the child needs assistive technology devices and services §300.324(a)(2)(v)				
The IEP includes measurable annual goals based on content standards for the student's enrolled grade, including academic and functional goals. §300.320(a)(2)				• IEP – Annual goals • Evaluation results • IEP committee recommendations • Consideration of special factors • Measurable annual goals • Examples of methods of measurement
Benchmarks or short-term objectives should be included for students with disabilities who take alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards. §300.320(a)(2)(ii)				• IEP – Annual goals • IEP – Significant cognitive disability determination • IEP – Statewide assessments
The IEP contains program modifications or classroom accommodations. §300.320(a)(4)				• IEP – Program modifications • IEP – Accommodations
The IEP contains a statement of supports for school personnel. §300.320(a)(4)				• IEP – Supports for personnel

The IEP contains related services that address the needs of the student and support annual goals. §300.320(a)(4)					• IEP – Related services • Program services • Placement determination checklist • Examples of method of measurement • Educational need areas
The IEP contains appropriate accommodations necessary to measure academic achievement and functional performance on state or district-wide assessments. §300.320(a)(6)(i)					• IEP – Statewide assessments • IEP – Accommodations
If the IEP committee determined that the student will not participate in the regular state or district-wide assessment, the IEP contains a statement of why the student cannot participate in the regular assessment. §300.320(a)(6)(ii)					• Documentation of assessment results • Statewide assessment results • Eligibility criteria checklists, where applicable • IEP-SCD Determination Section • Other relevant information
The IEP contains an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with nondisabled students in the general education classroom and the LEA ensured that to the maximum extent possible the student with disabilities was educated with nondisabled students. §300.320(a)(5)					• IEP – Nonparticipation justification
The IEP contains special education and related services, including location, duration, and frequency. §300.320(a)(7)					• IEP – Special education & related services • Program services • Placement determination checklist

					• Statement of specifically designed instruction
The student's progress toward meeting the annual goals was measured and the IEP addresses that periodic report(s) of progress are provided to the student's parents. §300.320(a)(3)					• IEP – Report of progress • Progress reports • Methods of measurement

The IEP had been reviewed at least annually and revised to address any/all of the following:
    • any lack of expected progress toward annual goals and in the general curriculum;
    • results of any reevaluation conducted;
    • information about the child provided to, or by, the parents; and
    • the child's anticipated needs or other matters. §300.324(b)(1)(i)(ii)(A–E)
					• IEP & amendments
					• IEP progress reports
					• Evaluation results
					• Parent input

Extended school year services (ESYS) are considered annually. §300.106(a)					• ESYS Determination letter • ESYS Student Eligibility Review form • ESYS Documentation forms
If the IEP has been modified, correct procedures and notice requirements for making changes to the IEP were followed. §300.324(a)(4)					• Prior Written Notice • IEP – Summary of revision

Secondary Transition					
	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
The IEP includes age-appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals in the areas of training, education, employment, and, as needed, independent living. §300.320(b)(1) and §300.43(1)(2)(b)					• IEP – Individual transition plan, postsecondary goals • Transition folder/binder
The postsecondary goals were reviewed or updated annually. §300.324					• IEP – Individual transition plan
The transition postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessments. §300.320 and §300.324					• IEP – Individual transition plan, age-appropriate transition assessments
The annual IEP goals are related to the student's transition service needs. §300.320(7)(b)(1-2)					• IEP – Individual transition plan & transition services • IEP – Annual goals
The IEP includes transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her goals. §300.320					• IEP – Individual transition plan, transition services
The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals. §300.320					• IEP – Course of Study • Copy of Transition assessment(s)
There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting. §300.321 and §300.322					• Notice of Committee Meeting to student • IEP – Signature page
There is evidence that agency representatives were invited to the IEP meeting, if appropriate. §300.321					• Documentation of invitation
There was consent obtained from the parent or student who has reached the age of majority prior to inviting adult agencies to the meeting. §300.321					• Consent for inviting adult service agency

Discipline					
	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
The LEA conducted a manifestation determination within ten (10) days of any decision to change the placement of a student with a disability because of a violation of a code of student conduct. §300.530(e)(1)					• Manifestation determination review form • Prior Written Notice • Documentation of out-of-school suspensions and/or expulsions • Student discipline record documenting cumulative days of out-of-school suspension or expulsion, from which the manifestation determination review timeline can be calculated
The LEA notified the parent on the same day as the date of the removal decision of any removal that constituted a change of placement and provided the parent with a copy of the notice of the procedural safeguards. §300.530(h)					• Prior Written Notice • Letter or Due Process Form documenting the parent was notified of change of placement and procedural safeguards • Notice of Committee Meeting
The IEP committee considered relevant information in the student's file, including the student's IEP, any teacher observations, and any relevant information provided by the parent, to determine whether the behavior was a manifestation of the student's disability. §300.530(e)(1)					• Manifestation determination review form • Prior Written Notice
If the IEP committee determined that the behavior was not a manifestation of the student's disability and the					• Attendance records • Service provider logs

Requirement					Documentation
suspension/expulsion was applied resulting in a change in placement, the student continued to receive services so as to enable the student to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the student's IEP. §300.530(d)(1)(i)					
If the IEP committee determined that the behavior was a manifestation of the student's disability, the student was returned to the current placement, unless the parent and the LEA agreed to a change in placement as part of the Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) or unless the behavior was related to weapons, drugs, or serious bodily injury. §300.530(f) and (g)					• Prior Written Notice • Behavior Intervention Plan • Student discipline records
If the student did not have a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) developed and a BIP implemented prior to the disciplinary removal, and the behavior was determined by the IEP committee to be a manifestation of the disability, the IEP committee completed the FBA and developed a BIP as soon as possible. §300.530(d) and (f)(1)(i–ii)					• Functional Behavior Assessment • Behavior Intervention Plan
If the student had a BIP, the IEP committee reviewed the plan as part of the manifestation determination process and revised it as needed. §300.530(f)(1)(ii)					• Behavior Intervention Plan • Prior Written Notice
If the student was suspended from school for more than 10 days (consecutive, or cumulative when determined to be a change in placement), the LEA provided services beginning by the 11th day of suspension. §300.530 (b)(2)					• Student discipline records • Attendance records • Service provider logs • Progress reports • Work samples

					• Teacher notes • Observations and interviews

Early Childhood Transition					
	Yes	No	NA	Rationale for No & Comments	Potential Source(s)
Appropriate LRE placement is determined annually and educational environment setting for children ages 3–5 is accurately reported to MDE OSE. §300.114					• IEP – LRE Determination
IEP includes accurate reporting of present-level academic achievement and functional performance in Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 and for each of the outcome areas included parent input, ECO rating, Anchor Assessment, and AA/IF/F Skills. Part B SPP/APR Indicator B7: Preschool Outcomes					• IEP – PLAAFP
For preschoolers transitioning from an early intervention program (Part C), a transition planning conference was held, and the IEP was developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. §300.124 and §300.101(b)					• Documentation of invitation • IEP • Prior Written Notice • Documentation of transition conference notes
An LEA representative participated in the transition conference arranged with the early intervention program for a preschooler who was transitioning from an early intervention program. §300.124(c)					• Prior Written Notice listing IEP participants • Documentation of invitation • IEP – Signature page • Conference summary with LEA representative's signature

Interview and Focus Group Protocol & Potential Questions

Interview questions are informed by the pre–on-site meeting and on-site activities. Below are some general questions that can be asked to various LEA staff and stakeholders. Additional questions will be developed and posed based on Pre–On-Site and On-Site Monitoring activities. All interview and focus group responses are kept anonymous unless the participant requests follow-up actions. All interviews and focus groups are conducted by at least two members of the MDE OSE team. The number of interviews and focus groups will be determined based on the Pre–On-Site and On-Site monitoring activities. Based on what it learns and observes through other activities, MDE OSE may request additional interviews during the on-site visit.

1. Are young children with disabilities entering kindergarten ready to learn? [Indicators 6, 7, & 12] If not, what are the barriers? What has the LEA done to improve their readiness?
2. Are children with disabilities afforded equal educational opportunities? Equal educational opportunities are defined as access to the general education curriculum. [Indicators 3, 4, 5, 8, 15, & 16] If not, what are the barriers? What has the LEA done to improve opportunities?
3. Are youth with disabilities prepared for life, work, and postsecondary education? [Indicators 1, 2, 13, & 14] If not, what are the barriers? What has the LEA done to improve preparation?
4. Does the LEA implement IDEA with fidelity? [Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, & 13] What tools are in place to help LEA staff know they are accurately implementing IDEA? What actions does the LEA take when it finds that staff are not accurately implementing IDEA?
5. Are parental concerns and input considered in the development of each IEP? §300.324(a)(1)(ii)
6. Tell us about family and community engagement within your LEA and, if relevant, include how complaints or concerns are resolved.

Graduation & Dropout:
1. Describe supports provided for on-track graduation for general education and special education students and highlight any similarities and differences.
2. How is Post-School Outcome data reviewed and utilized to improve programs and student outcomes?
3. Describe any unique or special circumstances that MDE OSE needs to know in order to understand why your LEA's graduation rates for students with IEPs are low.
4. Describe the LEA's participation in any school-/LEA-wide initiative to increase the rate of graduation.
5. What are the LEAs strengths and areas for improvement related to graduation and dropout?

Secondary Transition:
1. Describe the manner in which the LEA staff communicate with each other across departments in relation to transition planning.
2. How do you ensure staff is knowledgeable about the procedures necessary for completing all of the required transition components?
3. Describe how transition services were provided to each student receiving special education services during the 12 months preceding the academic year for which numbers indicate an unusually low graduation rate. If transition services were provided to some students and not others, indicate what those services were and how the provision of transition services correlated to the likelihood of graduation.
4. Describe the partnership between your LEA and Vocational Rehabilitation, and the

referral process to adult serving agencies, as necessary.
5. What are the LEAs strengths and areas for improvement related to secondary transition?

Child Find:
1. Does the LEA have a tracking system that provides special education staff with the ability to follow the progress of a student through the evaluation process in order to ensure that timelines are not missed because of inattention to deadlines? If so, describe the tracking process.
2. Describe how the multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) or another school-wide support system works to provide interventions for all struggling students, including students with disabilities. How does the framework help to identify students for Child Find activities?
3. How do general education teachers know when to refer a student for a special education evaluation? How does the team determine what, if any, additional data are needed?
4. At what point in the process is parental consent acquired for evaluation? How does this impact the process?
5. What challenges does your LEA experience with the Child Find process?
6. Since delays are often attributable to not having enough staff to complete evaluations, does the LEA have a contingency plan when staff are unavailable to complete evaluations and/or reports?
7. Describe the process for when the evaluation needs of a student exceed the staff's areas of expertise or experience. Do you have ready resources to follow up on vision, hearing, or behavioral concerns? Has the need for medical certification contributed to any delays?

Discipline:
1. How do you track the removal of students with disabilities from school, including through in-school suspension and informal removals?
2. Tell us the process for reviewing and revising behavior intervention plans for students who have had Manifestation Determination Reviews.
3. Describe your LEA discipline procedure and include details on progressive discipline and alternatives to discipline utilized.
4. Describe the training, professional development, and technical assistance provided to support positive behavioral supports and interventions.
5. What are the LEAs strengths and areas for improvement related to discipline?

Classroom Observation

MDE OSE and the LEA team will conduct classroom observations to verify the results of the student files reviews and Pre–On-Site data reviews, verify that students are receiving the special education and related services on their IEPs in the LRE, and observe any promising practices occurring in schools. Observers should bring the following supplemental information for comparison during the classroom observation: IEPs of students, including a list of services, supports, accommodations, and modifications; and student schedules.

LEA:		
Teacher:		
Date/Time:		
Grade Level/Content Area:		
Environment (compliance)	Yes/No	Evidence
The student's placement is in accordance with the IEP.		
Environment (promising practices)	Yes/No	Evidence
Classroom management and organization; rules, procedures, and behavior expectations are evident and posted		
Presence and use of manipulatives, objects, and real-world and diverse examples		
Effective and efficient transitions between activities		
Word walls and key vocabulary charts are created with/by students; contain symbols/pictures		
Participation of the student in the classroom		
Access to General Curriculum (compliance)	Yes/No	Evidence
Student has access to grade-level content		
Student work is aligned to grade-level content		
Access to Typical Peers as Indicated in the IEP (compliance and promising practice)	Yes/No	Evidence
Student's schedule and presence reflect placement decision in the IEP.		
Student is seated alongside typical peers in the general seating arrangement.		
Student is included as an active participant of the class.		
Access to Appropriately Trained Teacher(s) (promising practice)	Yes/No	Evidence
Teacher conducts frequent checks for student understanding, provides feedback, adapts content and teaching style, and/or differentiates instruction.		
Teacher provides clear academic objectives and behavioral expectations.		

Access to Specially Designed Instruction (compliance)	Yes/No	Evidence
Teacher has access to and uses the student's IEP.		
Teacher adapts the content, methods, and/or instructional delivery to address the unique needs of the student in accordance with the IEP.		
Access to Accommodations (compliance)	Yes/No	Evidence
Student has access to all of the accommodations listed in the IEP appropriate for the observation setting.		

Review of Policies & Procedures

MDE OSE completes a targeted review of the LEA's policies and procedures for compliance with IDEA and to identify areas for improvement. This review is informed by results from the LEA's risk assessment, self-assessment, and other on-site monitoring activities. The purpose of the review is to identify areas for improvement in the LEA's system or infrastructure, including policies and procedures, that may be contributing to noncompliance as well as promising practices. Based upon the results of its review, MDE OSE may make suggestions or require LEAs to submit updated policies and procedures to strengthen internal controls and implementation.

General Questions

How does the LEA review and revise their policies and procedures? (at what regularly occurring interval are they reviewed?)
- Who is accountable for updating policies and procedures?
- How are policies and procedures communicated to and made available for schools, programs, and staff?
- Do the LEA's policies and procedures include any egregious concerns (e.g., blatant noncompliance)?
- Does the LEA have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the provisions of a FAPE for students with disabilities, including:
  - Students receive comparable instructional time as their nondisabled peers (i.e., buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to nondisabled peers).
  - Students on a shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement in their IEPs, which have been agreed upon by parents.
  - Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services. 300.101, Miss. Admin Code 7-3: 74.19(1)(b)

Evaluation, Reevaluation, & Eligibility

	Yes/No	Evidence
Do the LEA's policies and procedures address necessary components as indicated in the Evaluation, Reevaluation, & Eligibility file review section of the On-Site Monitoring Protocol? §300.300(c)(1), §300.304(b)(1), §300.304(2), §300.305, §300.306, 300.311		
Does the LEA have Child Find (CF) policies and procedures in effect, including those addressing special populations, and specifically state requests for an evaluation may not be limited by the number per year or time of year a request is received? Special populations include: • Homeless children • Wards of the state • Private school children		

• Children advancing from grade to grade • Highly mobile and/or migrant children §300.301, §300.111(A)(C)		
Does the LEA have policies and procedures for receiving and documenting verbal and written requests for a comprehensive evaluation from parent, public agency, teacher, and/or Teacher Support Team? SBP 300.301(b)		
Does the LEA have policies and procedures to support SBP 300.301's requirements on timelines for: • holding an MET meeting with the participation of appropriate members within 14 calendar days of receiving a request to determine the need for comprehensive evaluations? SBP 300.301(b)(1) and • providing written notice of the committee's decision to the parent within 7 days of the MET meeting? SBP §300-301(b)(1)(i)(a), §300-§301(b)(1)(ii)(a), §300-301(b)(1)(iii)(a)		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures include multiple ways to determine disability, including a process that assesses the child's response to scientific, research-based interventions for determining specific learning disabilities? (not required, promising practice)		
Does the LEA have procedures to ensure that a referral for and evaluation of a child with a suspected disability is not delayed or denied because of implementation of an RTI strategy? §300.8, §300.301, §300.304, and §300.305(a)(1)(2)		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures include guidance for distinguishing language differences from language or communication disorders and therefore allow for dual identification as an ELL if necessary? (not required, promising practice)		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures incorporate awareness of student needs, social/cultural backgrounds, and culturally based forms of behavior? (not required, promising practice)		

Timely Evaluation

	Yes/No	Evidence
Does the LEA have clearly articulated policies and procedures for obtaining parental consent for evaluation and participation?		
Does the LEA have policies and procedures that ensure children referred to Part B for evaluation receive that evaluation within 60 days from parental consent?		
Does the LEA have a policy or procedure for when an evaluation is not completed within 60 days from parental consent?		

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

	Yes/No	Evidence
Do the LEA's policies and procedures address necessary components as indicated in the IEP file review section of the On-Site Monitoring Protocol? §300.106(a), §300.320, §300.321(a)–(b), §300.324, §300.501(b)		
Does the LEA have procedures outlining the process to make IEP amendments?		
Does the LEA have procedures for determining eligibility for and the provision of Extended School Year services?		

LRE/Placement

	Yes/No	Evidence
Do the LEA's policies and procedures address necessary components as indicated in the LRE file review section of the LEA Self-Assessment? §300.116(B), §300.320(A)(6)(I), §300.320(A)(5), §300.324(A)(2)		
Does the public agency have policies and procedures in effect to ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services and the continuum of alternative placement is not separate from nondisabled peers? §300.115(a)(b)		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures include guidance on using data for progress monitoring, implementation of interventions, and reevaluation placement?		

Parent Involvement

	Yes/No	Evidence
Do the LEA's policies and procedures ensure that all parents/families receive communications regarding instructional and behavioral policies and notice of procedural safeguards?		
Are these communications provided in the child's home language?		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures for PWN include sources for the parent to contact to obtain assistance?		
Is the process for filing a formal state complaint or due process hearing complaint clear? Does the LEA provide a model form showing the required components of a complaint?		

Discipline

	Yes/No	Evidence
Does the LEA have discipline policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that ensure compliance with IDEA and SBP 74.19 for discipline of students with disabilities? §300.107(a)		
Does the LEA have procedures for prevention and intervention prior to office referrals for discipline?		
Does the LEA have procedures describing how to collect and report discipline data, including for in-school suspensions and informal removals?		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures incorporate awareness of student needs, social/cultural backgrounds, and culturally based forms of behavior? (not required, promising practice)		
Does the LEA have policies and procedures to ensure FBAs include the following: • A clear description of the problematic behavior; • Identification of the antecedent events, times, and situations that predict when the problem behavior will occur; • Identification and consequences of the problem behavior; • Development of hypotheses and summary statements that describe the		

problem behavior and its functions; and • Collection of data from a variety of sources: interviews, direct observations, etc.? SBP 300.530(d)		

Disproportionate Representation

	Yes/No	Evidence
Does the LEA have policies and procedures that ensure appropriate identification (e.g., culturally responsive assessments)?		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures include routine examination of student performance data by race/ethnicity and the development of school improvement plans where appropriate? (not required, promising practice)		

Transition from Early Childhood

	Yes/No	Evidence
Do the LEA's policies and procedures describe the Part C entities and an expectation for ongoing communication between the LEA and the Part C entities that refer to the LEA?		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures address necessary components as indicated in the ECSE file review section of the LEA Self-Assessment? §300.321, §300.124, §300.323		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures include guidance around the responsibilities to implement Part B services for an eligible child referred from Part C Early Intervention (EI) by the child's third birthday?		

Postsecondary Transition

	Yes/No	Evidence
Does the LEA have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the graduation requirements? Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 36.1		
Do the LEA's policies and procedures address necessary components as indicated in the secondary transition file review section of the On-Site Monitoring Protocol? §300.43(1)(2)(b), §300.320, §300.321, §300.322, §300.324, §300.530		

Do the LEA's policies and procedures include guidance for providing subsequent supports for students exiting from special education due to graduating or aging out? (not required, promising practice)		

Timely Correction

	Yes/No	Evidence
Does the LEA have policies and procedures in place regarding timely correction of noncompliance, including for findings identified through due process hearings?		

Summary of Findings

This summary of findings is for the MDE OSE team's use during and following the on-site visit. These are preliminary results from the on-site visit to highlight strengths and growth areas by each of the on-site activities and determination of performance for the Priority Target Areas.

The following table summarizes the strengths and areas of growth initially identified during the on-site activities.

	Strength	Growth Area
Student reviews		
Interviews		
Observations		
Policies & procedure review		

The Priority Target Areas were discussed and identified during pre–on-site activities. Preliminary determination of performance in target areas during the on-site visit is included in the table below.

Priority Target Areas	Determination of Performance (Compliant, Isolated Incidences of Noncompliance, or Systemic Noncompliance)
[Target Area 1]	
[Target Area 2]	
[Target Area 3]	

Comprehensive Monitoring Report of Findings – Template

Within 90 days of the on-site visit, MDE provides each LEA with a Comprehensive Monitoring Report of Findings (Report).

Overview & Introduction

The MDE team extends gratitude and appreciation to [INSERT LEA NAME] for its efforts, attention, resources, and time committed during the on-site review held on [INSERT DATE].

As part of Mississippi's general supervision responsibilities under IDEA and 7 Miss. Code R §34-B-300.149, the Monitoring Report is a summary of the on-site visit and includes any findings of noncompliance, required corrective actions, and recommendations for the LEA.

Scope

During the on-site visit, MDE monitors the LEA's implementation of IDEA and State Board Policy Chapter 74, Rule 74.19 to ensure compliance and positive results for students with disabilities. The focus of the review is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities and ensure the LEA meets IDEA Part B requirements.

MDE's monitoring process includes pre–on-site activities, on-site activities, and post–on-site activities.

Methodology

MDE completed records reviews on select IEP files for students with disabilities within [INSERT LEA NAME], which includes representation from the following schools: [INSERT SCHOOL NAMES]. In total, [#]student files were reviewed utilizing the MDE Student Review Forms. Teams reviewed files for compliance with the areas of [SELECT FROM: Evaluation, Reevaluation, & Eligibility; IEP; Secondary Transition; Discipline; and Early Childhood].

MDE also conducted classroom observations, specifically looking at the school and classroom environment, access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities, typical peers, and trained teachers. Additionally, the classroom observers looked for a linkage between students' IEPs and specially designed instruction, accommodation, and modifications evident during the observation.

Interviews were completed by MDE with various LEA stakeholders, including the following: [INSERT STAKEHOLDER TYPES, NOT NAMES, E.G. PARENT]. Interviews were conducted with a specific focus on the areas identified as target areas during the pre–on-site activities.

MDE OSE reviewed relevant policies and procedures to identify areas for improvement in the LEA's system or infrastructure that may be contributing to noncompliance. Specifically, MDE checked for inconsistencies with federal and state policy, as well as specific regulatory language that was omitted from LEA policies and procedures but is pertinent for carrying out activities in compliance with statute, and areas that may be unclear for school personnel.

Onsite Monitoring Visit Results
Areas of Strength

Findings of Noncompliance – including reasons for noncompliance
- Summary by area and degree of noncompliance

Required Corrective Action & related progress monitoring timelines
- Address the issues identified above and include a timeline for MDE OSE follow-up with the LEA.
- What feedback loop can be embedded here so LEAs know what to expect next?

Required Evidence for verification of correction
- Prong 1 & 2

Opportunities for Improvement and Recommendations
- Overall – Universal TA
- Targeted support for specific areas identified during the on-site visit
- Recommended areas identified as priority based on the review of parent data (state complaint, dispute resolution, and informal complaints)
- Work with the TA team to complete a root cause analysis to address systemic noncompliance
- Connections to national, Mississippi, and other resources available

Corrective Action Plan – Template

LEA Name: _____ LEA Number: _____
Date CAP Approved by Local School Board: _____

Findings	Strategies/Plan for Correction	Person(s) Responsible	Evaluation Criteria	Implementation Timeline

Appendix F: Sample Timeline* of Monitoring Activities and Communication to LEAs

Date	Activities
July-August	MDE, OSE conducts the LEA Cyclical Monitoring trainings
August-September	MDE, OSE notifies LEAs to complete Self-Assessment and assigns an MDE, OSE Monitoring Specialist
September-October	LEAs complete Self-Assessment and submit files for verification
October-December	MDE, OSE conduct LEA file verification and on-site notification (determined by previous risk score)
January	MDE, OSE complete cyclical on-site activities and conduct current year Risk-Based Assessment
January	MDE, OSE identify and notify districts Intensive Monitoring
March (within 90 days of verification)	MDE, OSE issue final Monitoring Reports (desk-audits only)
February-March	MDE, OSE conducts Intensive Monitoring activities
April (within 90 days of completion of activities)	LEAs respond to Cyclical Monitoring Reports/submit Corrective Action Plans (CAPs)(desk audits) and the MDE, OSE issue final Monitoring Reports for Cyclical Monitoring (on-site visits)
May-June (within 30 days of Monitoring Report)	LEAs respond to Cyclical Monitoring Reports/submit Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) and the MDE, OSE issue final Monitoring Reports for Intensive Monitoring
Monthly or as needed	MDE, OSE will follow up and meet with LEA staff to monitor the implementation of CAPs until Clearance
No later than 1 year from Monitoring Report	MDE, OSE verifies LEA compliance and issues a Clearance Letter

*Timelines may be subject to change.