

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

### Executive Summary:

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

### General Supervision System:

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

Mississippi's system of general supervision is an integrated system which includes the following activities:

- 1) Integrated Monitoring Activities (on-site monitoring, desk-audits, self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Application)
- 2) Data (database, desk-audits)
- 3) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation (self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Application)
- 4) State Performance Plan
- 5) Dispute Resolution (on-site investigations, desk audits)
- 6) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development (on-site, collaborative targeted technical assistance)
- 7) Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
- 8) Fiscal Management (desk-audits, on-site investigations, technical assistance)

LEAs in the 2013-2014 school year were selected for on-site monitoring visits to investigate formal State complaints, to conduct investigative audits, and to conduct audits of non-public schools and State agencies. Desk audits were conducted through reviews of the State database during this same period of time.

Mississippi's system of general supervision also includes State audits. These include accreditation audits, investigative audits, and audits of non-public schools and State agencies. The State Board of Education (SBE), Commission on School Accreditation, or the State Superintendent of Education may call for an investigative audit at any time, which may include a comprehensive evaluation of special education programs and IDEA compliance. Audits are conducted for a variety of reasons, including complaints, fiscal, and cross-departmental concerns. Improvement plans and technical assistance visits are the primary methods used to verify implementation of corrective actions. Comprehensive follow-up visits are also conducted approximately 3 to 4 months after the initial visit. Any LEA that fails to provide sufficient documentation that all areas of

noncompliance have been resolved within 12 months is subject to automatic and mandatory sanctions, including a report to the Office of Accreditation and a recommendation to the Commission on School Accreditation to take immediate action to downgrade the accreditation status of the LEA. Intensive technical assistance is provided to sanctioned LEAs. Continued noncompliance may ultimately result in withholding of funds.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The Office of Special Education provides technical assistance, professional development opportunities, guidance and support to parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers regarding the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), State Board Policy 7219, and research-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 7219, to promote access to the general education curriculum and to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

Technical assistance is provided through both informal and formal methods. Staff in the Office of Special Education provide technical assistance on an on-going daily basis through our responsiveness to phone calls and emails from parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers regarding the requirements of IDEA and State Board Policy 7219 in the provision of services, implementation of programs and protections for children and youth with disabilities. More formal methods of technical assistance include professional development delivered to individual districts following a formal request for training in a specific area(s) of need, regional training sessions scheduled across the state in identified areas of need, technical assistance that is targeted to address an identified need (systemic areas of need, priority areas identified through on-going review and analysis of data, priority areas of need as determined appropriate by the Mississippi Department of Education). Technical assistance is also provided to local school districts by reviewing local district Policies and Procedures, Individualized Education Programs, and Transition Plans to provide recommendations and feedback on the documents reviewed and analyzed.

Technical assistance needs are data-driven and evolve from many activities/sources such as on-site monitoring, desk-audits, self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Applications, database reviews, review of local Policies and Procedures, Formal State Complaints, as well as through surveys or Needs Assessments completed by the local school districts.

The Office of Special Education has increased collaborative efforts with other MDE program offices to deliver technical assistance across offices in an effort to support general educators' capacity to instruct children with disabilities and to ensure administrators understand the requirements of implementing IDEA requirements and State Board Policy 7219 for children with disabilities served by the local school district. Staff in the OSE has also supported training and technical assistance efforts provided by other MDE program offices in an effort to support the needs of all students as articulated through the Mississippi Department of Education's vision, mission, and Strategic Plan.

As a result of Mississippi receiving a federal determination of "needs assistance, Mississippi has received technical assistance from the following sources: the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) in the significant work that has been done in the development and implementation of Mississippi's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP); the School-wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) in a small number of school districts and using the SWIFT model/concept to support the implementation of Mississippi's SSIP; Kim Hartsill, independent contractor to provide technical assistance with monitoring efforts and activities, including general supervision activities, and the development and implementation of Mississippi's SSIP; Brustein and Manasevit regarding federal education regulations and legislative practices, specifically with funding sources and blending and braiding of federal funds; Council of Chief State School Officers SCASS groups and networking with other states and their available resources; and Art Cernosia, Esq. regarding legal issues, monitoring, and enforcement.

All technical assistance sources have been utilized to drive decision-making at the SEA, and to inform policy, procedures, and practice at the LEA level. The guidance provided to LEAs is designed to ensure compliant practice, improve positive outcomes for children and their families, build capacity for schools and districts to scale up and out instructionally to ensure children and youth in Mississippi graduate from school prepared for college and the workforce.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Professional Development System:**

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

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) provides professional development opportunities regarding the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), State Board Policy 7219, and research-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 7219. Professional development opportunities are provided to parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers and are focused on strategies designed to promote students with disabilities access to the general education curriculum and to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

The MDE has implemented a system designed to deliver professional development opportunities through collaborative efforts with multiple program offices within the agency as well as external agency collaboration. A relatively new format for deploying professional development resources is the employment of Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) and Educators in Residence (EiR). Staff employed as an EiR or a PDC have primary responsibility for the delivery of professional development within cohort groups or assigned districts, thereby providing a level of sustainability. This format ensures consistent sustainability with on-going professional development activities, guided practice, observations, and feedback. This format allows for more of a coaching or modeling process than what is traditionally provided during a training session. While the EiR or the PDC may initiate the delivery of professional development through an initial training session, there are multiple opportunities for follow-up and on-going activities following the initial training to support and enhance the ability of the school-based personnel to build capacity within the school setting and to further develop skills in identified areas of prioritized needs.

The MDE has strengthened its ability to deliver professional development through the involvement of the EiR and PDCs. This model has been highly successful as we have utilized these positions in a number of program offices under the leadership of the Chief Academic Officer. Literacy coaches have been employed in this capacity and are able to better address literacy efforts across the State in a sustained manner. Professional Development Coordinators and Educators in Residence are also employed in the Offices of Special Education, Professional Development, Student Assessment, Early Childhood, and Elementary Education. Their primary responsibility is to design and deliver professional development opportunities to educators and administrators that reflects scientifically research-based strategies and practices in an effort to build capacity for schools and districts to scale up and out instructionally to ensure children and youth in Mississippi graduate from school prepared for college and the workforce.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The State Special Education Advisory Panel consists of 25 members representing parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, IHL (Institutions of Higher Learning) representatives, State and local officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools, and a representative of a vocational community or business organization concerned with transition services to children with disabilities. The Advisory Panel members are appointed by the State Superintendent of Education and they serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education concerning: unmet needs within the State in the education of Students with Disabilities (SWD), the development of evaluations and reporting of data, the development of improvement plans, and the development and implementation of policies and procedures. The mission of the Special Education Advisory Panel is to promote the education of children and youth with disabilities. The panel provides advice and guidance to the MDE/OSE, regarding the education and related services of children and youth with disabilities in Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). The advice and guidance includes input from citizens and constituent groups. Additional information on the Mississippi Advisory Panel may be found online at <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/special-education/special-education-advisory-panels>.

Continuous input is solicited as evidenced by the SPP/APR presentations that were made during two of the State Special Education Advisory Panel public meetings held this past year. One presentation outlined the State’s determination of Meets Requirements and the criteria used by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for the State Education Authority (SEA) Determinations. Other presentations during the year provided the group with an overview of each individual Indicator, proposed new targets, and discussions on Results-Based Accountability. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed. All Advisory Panel meetings are open to the public and opportunities are provided to allow for public comment during each of these meetings. Comments also may be submitted in writing and those comments are also presented during the panel's public meetings. Dates for each meeting are published in advance and public notice of each meeting is disseminated via the MDE/OSE web page, EdUpdate, newspaper advertisements, mass mail-outs to parent advocacy groups, and other interested parties. Agendas for each meeting are also posted to the OSE web site approximately two weeks in advance of each meeting.

Additionally, input on the SPP/APR was solicited from LEA personnel during presentations made at each quarterly LEA Special Education Director’s Meeting. These meetings also serve to keep the LEAs informed and focused on the 18 Indicators of the SPP/APR. Discussions were led by OSE staff in order to familiarize the LEAs with the requirements, targets, and calculations for each Indicator. OSE staff requested input from LEA personnel through these meetings and reviewed each suggestion offered.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The Mississippi SPP and APR will be disseminated to the public through the constituencies of various stakeholder groups, including the State Special Education Advisory Panel and parent advocacy groups in the same manner as previous APRs and the SPP have been distributed. It will be posted, along with the publicly reported LEA data, on the MDE/OSE website for review and downloading once the APR clarification week with OSEP has passed, <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/special-education/special-education-spp-apr>.

Currently, the MDE reports special education data in multiple ways. Data for children with disabilities can be found through the Mississippi Report Card (<http://www.msreportcard.com/>) and the Mississippi Assessment and Accountability Reporting System (<http://ors.mde.k12.ms.us/>). A web page specifically for the SPP/APR that showcases the SPP, prior APRs, publicly reported data, and technical assistance documents (<http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/special-education/special-education-spp-apr>) exists on the MDE/OSE website.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2014 and 2015 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 30, 2015 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State did not provide the required information.

**Indicator 1: Graduation**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			22.87%	23.37%	23.37%	63.00%	66.00%	66.00%	71.00%	71.00%
Data			22.87%	23.16%	23.16%	19.00%	20.00%	23.00%	31.91%	22.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	77.00%	77.00%	81.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	854	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	3,037	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	28.10%	Calculate 

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
854	3,037	22.50%	77.00%	28.10%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

#### Graduation Conditions Field

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

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

The graduation requirements in Mississippi associated with graduating with a standard high school diploma are the same for Students with Disabilities (SWD) as they are for Non-Disabled Only (NDO). Mississippi requirements for graduation with a standard high school diploma represent some of the most rigorous required by states. Youths in Mississippi must meet the following requirements for graduation with a standard high school diploma: a) earn a minimum of 24 Carnegie Units; b) take the following required, subject area courses - U.S. History from 1877, English II, Biology I, and Algebra I; and c) pass all end-of-course tests in the required subject areas noted in (b). LEAs have the authority to require additional Carnegie Units to meet local requirements for a standard high school diploma. Some local LEAs who utilize a 4 x 4 block or A/B block schedule require students to earn 26 – 28 Carnegie Units in order to receive a standard high school diploma. With the implementation of the more rigorous Mississippi College and Career State Standards, the number of students with disabilities graduating with a standard high school diploma has declined.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 2: Drop Out**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			12.74%	12.24%	12.24%	22.00%	18.00%		13.00%	10.00%
Data		16.99%	17.88%	16.76%	16.76%	24.00%	22.00%	10.77%	10.08%	9.35%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 2: Drop Out**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	893	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	1,669	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	8	null
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	283	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	10	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
283	2,863	9.35%	10.00%	9.88%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Use a different calculation methodology**

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			97.00%	40.00%	45.00%	45.00%	50.00%		18.30%	19.30%
Data		48.10%	35.35%	47.50%	5.20%	33.80%	23.00%	17.30%	7.80%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	20.30%	21.30%	22.30%	23.30%	24.30%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

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

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/16/2015	<a href="#">Number of districts in the State</a>	149	null

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Yes  No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP  AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
149	null	null	0%	20.30%		Incomplete Data	n/a

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

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

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students

### with IEPs

#### Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.00%	93.80%	95.70%	99.20%	97.70%	97.50%	98.00%	96.80%	95.53%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.00%	93.60%	95.60%	96.40%	97.60%	97.40%	97.90%	96.90%	95.46%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

**Data Source:** SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**Data Source:** SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/23/1015

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	31,622	29,154	95.53%	95.00%	92.20%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

Mississippi administered new assessments in 2014-2015. Students took two components of the assessment at two different times in the year. In order to be counted as participants and assigned a final score and performance level, students must have been enrolled at the time of both assessments and have two valid scores for both components.

The slippage seen for FFY 2014 can be attributed to this test design. Mississippi has procured a new assessment for administration in FFY 2015, so this should not continue to be an issue.

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	33,211	30,703	95.46%	95.00%	92.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

Mississippi administered new assessments in 2014-2015. Students took two components of the assessment at two different times in the year. In order to be counted as participants and assigned a final score and performance level, students must have been enrolled at the time of both assessments and have two valid scores for both components.

The slippage seen for FFY 2014 can be attributed to this test design. Mississippi has procured a new assessment for administration in FFY 2015, so this should not continue to be an issue.

#### Public Reporting Information

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

Public reporting of assessment results can be found in the following locations:

- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/report1/r2013-14.aspx>
- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/report1/r2014-15.aspx>
- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/data/>

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2014 publicly-reported assessment results.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

### Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

#### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			46.00%	32.30%	49.30%	49.30%	66.30%		45.00%	50.00%
			Data		37.00%	36.40%	19.00%	16.81%	19.80%	20.00%	22.20%	24.40%	19.85%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			40.00%	35.70%	51.70%	51.70%	68.00%		50.00%	54.00%
			Data		38.50%	37.10%	23.60%	23.59%	28.50%	29.10%	31.10%	33.80%	28.38%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	59.00%	63.00%	68.00%	73.00%	78.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvements activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed. On April 15, 2015, the revisions to the targets were reviewed with the Special Education Advisory Panel during a public meeting. Questions and comments from the floor were taken in addition to panel members. All targets were approved.

**Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

**FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

**Data Source:** SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**Data Source:** SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 4/23/16

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	29,154	3,521	19.85%	55.00%	12.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

Mississippi administered the new PARCC assessment in FFY 2014. This assessment was aligned to the more rigorous Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards, therefore the assessment had an increase in difficulty and rigor. It should be noted that Mississippi saw an increase in our NAEP scores and those scores are aligned with the proficiency results seen our state assessment, which indicates that we are seeing growth on the more rigorous assessments.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	30,703	3,405	28.38%	59.00%	11.09%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

Mississippi administered the new PARCC assessment in FFY 2014. This assessment was aligned to the more rigorous Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards, therefore the assessment had an increase in difficulty and rigor. It should be noted that Mississippi saw an increase in our NAEP scores and those scores are aligned with the proficiency results seen our state assessment, which indicates that we are seeing growth on the more rigorous assessments.

### Public Reporting Information

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

Public reporting of assessment results can be found in the following locations:

- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/report1/r2013-14.aspx>
- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/report1/r2014-15.aspx>
- <http://reports.mde.k12.ms.us/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2014 publicly-reported assessment results.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	3.29%	1.32%	1.32%	1.32%	28.95%	12.50%	7.95%	9.93%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/16/2015	<a href="#">Number of districts in the State</a>	149	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
14	149	9.93%	0%	9.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Mississippi uses a rate difference calculation for Indicator 4.

A "significant discrepancy" is defined as having students with disabilities (SWD) suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities (SWOD).

Mississippi uses the following comparison methodology defined in 34 CFR §300.170(a):

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

For Indicator 4A, an LEA will have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least 2 percentage points greater than its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

When significant discrepancy is determined for an LEA, the MDE/OSE will require the LEA to conduct a self-review of policies, procedures, and practices to determine if they contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Data on suspensions and expulsions is gathered from the State database. The data pertaining to SWD is taken from the 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to SWOD is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in the State database.

Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 for Indicator 4.

All districts met the minimum "n" size for Indicator 4a.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State reported that it used a minimum size requirement; however, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

The State did not report that it reviewed the districts' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2013.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

The State used a minimum size requirement; all districts did meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

The State has reviewed the districts' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2013.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
 

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
  - The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

#### OSEP Response

The State reported that it used a minimum size requirement; however, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

The State did not report that it reviewed the districts' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2013.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						1.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/16/2015	<a href="#">Number of districts in the State</a>	149	null

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	149	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

#### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Mississippi uses a rate difference calculation for Indicator 4.

A "significant discrepancy" is defined as having students with disabilities (SWD) suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities (SWOD).

Mississippi uses the following comparison methodology defined in 34 CFR §300.170(a):

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

For Indicator 4B, an LEA will have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from a racial/ethnic group is at least 2 percentage points greater than its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

When significant discrepancy is determined for an LEA, the MDE/OSE will require the LEA to conduct a self-review of policies, procedures, and practices to determine if they contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Data on suspensions and expulsions is gathered from the State database. The data pertaining to SWD is taken from the 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to SWOD is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in the State database.

Mississippi used a minimum “n” size of 10 for Indicator 4.

33 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code White

150 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code Pacific Islander

148 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code Native American

139 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code Multiple Races

114 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code Hispanic

All Districts met the minimum “n” size count for race code Black

145 Districts did not meet the minimum “n” size count for race code Asian

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State reported that it used a minimum size requirement; however, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

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

#### OSEP Response

The State reported that it used a minimum size requirement; however, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**Indicator 5: Education Environments**

**(children 6-21)**

**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			54.47%	55.47%	56.47%	57.47%	57.97%	58.47%	58.97%	59.47%
		Data		54.82%	60.67%	63.19%	65.19%	66.39%	66.97%	66.25%	67.05%	67.20%
B	2005	Target ≤			20.48%	19.48%	18.48%	17.98%	17.48%	16.98%	16.48%	15.98%
		Data		21.88%	17.22%	14.44%	12.46%	12.11%	12.89%	13.47%	13.82%	13.33%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.92%	1.99%	2.13%	2.09%	2.23%	2.17%	2.18%	2.25%
		Data		1.92%	1.99%	2.13%	2.09%	2.23%	2.17%	2.18%	2.26%	2.07%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	59.97%	60.47%	60.97%	61.47%	61.97%
Target B ≤	15.48%	14.98%	14.48%	13.98%	13.48%
Target C ≤	2.18%	2.11%	2.04%	1.97%	1.90%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 5: Education Environments**

**(children 6-21)**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	57,149	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	36,729	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	8,239	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	513	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	309	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	369	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	36,729	57,149	67.20%	59.97%	64.27%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,239	57,149	13.33%	15.48%	14.42%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,191	57,149	2.07%	2.18%	2.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									54.75%	64.80%
		Data									64.75%	67.22%
B	2011	Target ≤									25.07%	15.02%
		Data									15.07%	14.43%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.85%	64.90%	64.95%	65.00%	65.05%
Target B ≤	14.97%	14.92%	14.87%	14.82%	14.77%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	9,299	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</a>	6,110	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	1,032	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	224	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	1	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,110	9,299	66.42%	64.85%	65.71%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,257	9,299	14.51%	14.97%	13.52%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	56.99%
		Data					47.40%	47.00%	47.00%	48.00%	43.00%	56.99%
A2	2013	Target ≥						81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	81.74%
		Data					80.40%	79.00%	78.00%	79.00%	78.00%	81.74%
B1	2013	Target ≥						50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	64.01%
		Data					49.10%	45.00%	47.00%	51.00%	45.00%	64.01%
B2	2013	Target ≥						69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	74.37%
		Data					68.20%	62.00%	61.00%	65.00%	65.00%	74.37%
C1	2013	Target ≥						39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	42.24%
		Data					38.10%	40.00%	43.00%	40.00%	39.00%	42.24%
C2	2013	Target ≥						77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	71.78%
		Data					76.40%	73.00%	72.00%	74.00%	74.00%	71.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
Target A2 ≥	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Target B1 ≥	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target B2 ≥	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%
Target C1 ≥	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%
Target C2 ≥	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

1/5/2015 Deborah Donovan Visible to ED and State

Baselines and Targets were reset in FFY 2013 due to a change in measurement. Previously, Mississippi evaluated children ages 3-5 on an annual basis. Beginning in FFY 2013,

children were evaluated upon entry and exit in the preschool program.

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1156.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	63.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	168.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	45.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	187.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	693.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	232.00	463.00	56.99%	58.00%	50.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	880.00	1156.00	81.74%	83.00%	76.12%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of A1 Slippage

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

#### Explanation of A2 Slippage

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

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

	Number of Children
--	--------------------

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	39.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	206.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	97.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	247.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	567.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	344.00	589.00	64.01%	65.00%	58.40%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	814.00	1156.00	74.37%	75.00%	70.42%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of B1 Slippage**

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	34.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	287.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	33.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	127.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	675.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	160.00	481.00	42.24%	43.00%	33.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	802.00	1156.00	71.78%	73.00%	69.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

### Explanation of C1 Slippage

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

### Explanation of C2 Slippage

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to students transitioning between LEAs and not being properly identified. MDE/OSE will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Mississippi is participating in the 619 Powerful Data Cohort with DaSy for assistance with crafting a data system compatible with Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), but the primary focus will be increasing data reporting accuracy. Guidance will also be given to LEAs on data fidelity. Mississippi is also providing regional trainings on aligning IEP goals, early learning standards, and early childhood outcomes. All school district teachers and other interest staff will be invited to attend early childhood general education trainings involving early learning standards, teaching strategies, and assessments.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			63.46%	65.46%	67.46%	69.46%	71.46%	73.46%	75.46%	77.46%
Data		61.46%	61.80%	63.40%	94.80%	95.90%	95.80%	96.53%	96.70%	96.89%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	79.46%	81.46%	83.46%	85.46%	87.46%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
34754.00	35167.00	96.89%	79.46%	98.83%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

The State collected data for preschool children using the same survey and data collection method. Therefore, the data was collected in the same survey and not combined.

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

The survey used to collect this data was password-protected and available to LEA staff only. LEA staff are trained to administer the survey to parents during on-site meetings such as IEP meetings, open houses, etc. IP addresses, survey times, and other data collected from the survey are monitored to detect any possible data anomalies or discrepancies. The State's response rate for the survey is 59.10% of the total children served in the State. An analysis was conducted of the representativeness of gender, disability, and race. All groups were represented and no group had more than a 3% variance in representativeness.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/16/2015	<a href="#">Number of districts in the State</a>	149	null

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	149	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Mississippi has defined “disproportionate representation” as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater for overrepresentation. Mississippi conducted data analysis to investigate disproportionate representation of students with disabilities.

The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the number of students in a racial/ethnic group for the LEA is greater than or equal to 10. The equation used to calculate the alternate risk ratio is:

- Alternate risk ratio = LEA-level risk for racial/ethnic group for students with disabilities divided by State-level risk for comparison group for students with disabilities

The equation used to calculate LEA-level risk is:

- (The number of students with disabilities of a specific race/ethnicity divided by the total number of students enrolled with the same specific race/ethnicity) times 100

The equation used to calculate State-level risk is:

- (The number of students with disabilities in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined divided by the total number of students enrolled in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined) times 100

For example, to determine if disproportionate representation exists for Black students, the calculation is:

$$(\# \text{ of Black SWD in LEA} / \# \text{ of Black Students Enrolled in LEA}) * 100$$

---


$$(\# \text{ of Non-Black SWD in the State} / \# \text{ of Non-Black Students Enrolled in the State}) * 100$$

The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2012 Child Count Data, also known as 618 Table 1 data. The enrollment numbers are taken from the Month 1 Net Membership data in the State database.

Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center (SEAC) definition which states that disproportionality exists when a group is represented at a disproportionate rate higher than the group's representation in the population; all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered.

The determination of noncompliance is a two-step process. First, each LEA's data is examined to determine if disproportionate representation is identified in the population of students. The second step is to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Noncompliance is only existent when inappropriate identification is the cause for the disproportionate representation.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

OSEP could not determine whether the data for this indicator were valid and reliable, because the State did not indicate whether "All races and ethnicities were included in the review." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. The State must clarify whether its FFY 2014 data for this indicator are valid and reliable by indicating that, "All races and ethnicities were included in the review."

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories**  
**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/16/2015	<a href="#">Number of districts in the State</a>	149	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	149	0%	0%	0%

Status: Met Target  
 Slippage: No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

**Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation**

Mississippi has defined “disproportionate representation” as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater for overrepresentation. Mississippi conducted data analysis to investigate disproportionate representation of seven racial/ethnic groups.

The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the number of students in the racial/ethnic group for the LEA is greater than or equal to 10. The equation used to calculate the alternate risk ratio is:

- Alternate risk ratio = LEA-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability or educational environment category divided by State-level risk for comparison group for disability or educational environment category

The equation used to calculate LEA-level risk is:

- (The number of students in a specific race/ethnicity and disability category divided by the total number of students enrolled with the same specific race/ethnicity) times 100

The equation used to calculate State-level risk is:

- (The number of students in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined and a specific disability category divided by the total number of students enrolled in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined) times 100

For example, to determine if disproportionate representation exists for Black students in the disability category of ID, the calculation is:

$$(\# \text{ of Black ID students in LEA} / \# \text{ of Black students enrolled in LEA}) * 100$$

---


$$(\# \text{ of non-Black ID students in the State} / \# \text{ of non-Black students enrolled in the State}) * 100$$

The number of students in each disability and race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2012 Child Count Data, also known as 618 Table 1 data. The enrollment numbers are taken from the Month 1 Net Membership data in the State database.

Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center definition which states that disproportionality exists when a group is represented at a disproportionate rate higher than the group's representation in the population; all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered.

The determination of noncompliance as it relates to disproportionate representation is a two-step process. First, each LEA's data is examined to determine if disproportionate representation is identified in the population of students. The second step is to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Noncompliance is only existent when inappropriate identification is the cause for the disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State indicated in narrative that it included all races and ethnicities in its review of data for this indicator, but the State did not mark the provided box, that "All races and ethnicities were included in the review." The State must mark that box to confirm that it included all races and ethnicities.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		70.92%	80.00%	92.52%	97.36%	99.03%	99.09%	99.59%	99.95%	99.91%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

**Indicator 11: Child Find**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
1,240	1,240	99.91%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

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

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

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

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

Data for Indicator 11 were obtained from the State database, MSIS. Data were collected and analyzed for the period from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. Data for children for whom consent to conduct an initial evaluation was received during FFY 2014, but the timeline for completing the evaluation elapsed after the end of FFY 2014 were not included in the FFY 2014 data analysis and will be included in the FFY 2015 APR data collection.

Steps for data collection, determination of noncompliance, and issuance of findings:

- Step 1:** Gather data from the State database after the end of the 2014-2015 school year. All records are reviewed.
- Step 2:** Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and give them the opportunity to clarify their data and/or provide allowable exceptions.
- Step 3:** Review the responses and identify noncompliance (missed timelines that did not meet one of the allowable exceptions).
- Step 4:** Determine if LEAs with identified noncompliance have met both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

- **Step 4a:** Determine if the LEA has corrected original cases of noncompliance by completing the evaluations and eligibility determinations, although outside of the 60-day timeframe. (Prong 1)
- **Step 4b:** Gather data from the State database for the 2014-2015 school year to determine if LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and has achieved 100% compliance based on the review of this updated data. (Prong 2)

**Step 5:** Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2014-2015 school year and who did not meet both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance prior to the findings being issued.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Indicator 11: Child Find**  
**Required Actions from FFY 2013**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Indicator 11: Child Find**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The OSE has verified both LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2012: (Prong 1) have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA; and (Prong 2) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data collected through the State data system, MSIS, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

For both LEAs, the OSE then reviewed updated data from the 2014-2015 school year to determine if the LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and had achieved 100% compliance. It was determined that both LEAs satisfied the 2-pronged approach of verified correction of noncompliance in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 prior to the OSE's issuance of written notifications of findings. Therefore, no findings of noncompliance were issued.

In summation, both LEAs with identified noncompliance for FFY 2013:

Both LEAs were able to demonstrate correction of noncompliance based on reviews of updated data prior to the issuance of findings.

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

The OSE has verified that both LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2012: (Prong 1) have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA; and (Prong 2) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data collected through the State data system, MSIS, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

At the time of the data review, all LEAs had corrected the individual cases of identified noncompliance by completing the evaluations and eligibility determinations, although outside of the 60-day timeframe.

In summation, both LEAs with identified noncompliance for FFY 2013:

Both LEAs were able to demonstrate correction of noncompliance based on reviews of updated data prior to the issuance of findings.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		51.00%	29.43%	91.76%	94.90%	97.30%	93.94%	97.59%	96.13%	97.54%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	665
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	145
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	466
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	12
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	20

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	466	488	97.54%	100%	95.49%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	22
--	----

**Explanation of Slippage**

Mississippi did not meet the target and there was slippage. The slippage can be attributed to staff oversight at the LEA and transitioning staff.

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

The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed range from 0 to 103 days. The reason con the delays can be attributed to staff transitions and LEA staff oversite.

**Attached PDF table (optional)**

No PDF table was attached

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

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

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

Data for Indicator 12 were obtained from the State database, MSIS. Data was collected and analyzed for the period from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. OSE continuously works with the Lead Agency for Part C, Mississippi Department of Health (MDH) to coordinate the electronic data systems in order to collect accurate information relative to this Indicator. Daily files were submitted from MDH that allowed OSE to load the files into MSIS and run a matching procedure to determine how many

students being served under Part C were now being served under Part B. The OSE was able to provide data to LEAs that included a listing of eligible students receiving services at age 3 and those children currently being served by Part C who were referred to Part B. The LEAs in turn reported to OSE the status of each student in the reports. Once all the data was reported, OSE ran a process to pull data to indicate if all the students had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Steps for data collection, determination of noncompliance, and issuance of findings:

**Step 1:** Gather data from the State database after the end of the 2013-2014 school year. All records are reviewed.

**Step 2:** Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and give them the opportunity to clarify their data and/or provide allowable exceptions.

**Step 3:** Review the responses and identify noncompliance (missed timelines that did not meet one of the allowable exceptions).

**Step 4:** Determine if LEAs with identified noncompliance have met both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

- **Step 4a:** Determine if the LEA has corrected original cases of noncompliance by developing and implementing the IEP, although after the third birthday. (Prong 1)
- **Step 4b:** Gather data from the State database for the 2014-2015 school year to determine if LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and has achieved 100% compliance based on the review of this updated data. (Prong 2)

**Step 5:** Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2013-2014 school year and who did not meet both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance prior to the findings being issued.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

OSEP could not determine whether the source for the State's data for this indicator was State monitoring or a data base, because the State checked the box indicating that the source was "State monitoring," but stated in narrative that "Data for Indicator 12 were obtained from the State database, MSIS."

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The OSE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2013: (Prong 1) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA; and (Prong 2) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data collected through the State data system, MSIS, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The OSE required each LEA that was issued a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2013 develop and implement an Improvement Plan which included activities to ensure that timelines were met. The LEAs were required to submit to OSE a monthly data review of current referrals to ensure that timelines were being monitored. Upon a review of SY 2014-2015 data in the State database approximately 6 months after the issuance of the findings, all LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at that time. Thus, the correction of noncompliance from FFY 2013 was verified for all LEAs within 12 months in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

The OSE required each LEA that was issued a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2013 develop and implement an Improvement Plan which included activities to ensure that timelines were met. The LEAs were required to submit to OSE a monthly data review of current referrals to ensure that timelines were being monitored. Upon a review of SY 2014-2015 data in the State database approximately 6 months after the issuance of the findings, all LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at that time. Thus, the correction of noncompliance from FFY 2013 was verified for all LEAs within 12 months in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						100%	99.95%	99.48%	99.89%	99.73%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
9,576	9,578	99.73%	100%	99.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

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

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

Mississippi OSE staff monitored the data in the Statewide student information system closely throughout the 2013-2014 school year and notified LEAs by phone when it appeared that the LEA failed to indicate compliance with Indicator 13 in the database. The OSE asked the LEA to review the IEPs in question and make appropriate updates to the database. At a specified point in time, data was collected from the student information information and any IEPs that were not marked as compliant were sent to the OSE for review by Mississippi OSE staff for compliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The OSE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2013: (Prong 1) have reviewed and revised the IEP for each child identified in the original finding of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA; and (Prong 2) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The OSE required each LEA that was issued a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2013 to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan which included activities to ensure that noncompliance was corrected. Multiple follow-up visits were conducted to assist the LEAs with the correction of noncompliance and provide technical assistance. During each of the follow-up visits, additional records were reviewed and were found to be 100% compliant. Thus, the correction of noncompliance for all records from FFY 2012 was verified within 12 months in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

The OSE required each LEA that was issued a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2013 to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan which included activities to ensure that noncompliance was corrected. Multiple follow-up visits were conducted to assist the LEAs with the correction of noncompliance and provide technical assistance. The correction of the original cases of noncompliance was verified during follow-up visits in the LEAs. Thus, the correction of noncompliance for all records from FFY 2012 was verified within 12 months in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%
		Data						24.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	23.69%
B	2009	Target ≥							63.00%	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%
		Data						61.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	61.45%
C	2009	Target ≥							80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%
		Data						78.00%	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	80.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%
Target B ≥	71.00%	73.00%	75.00%	77.00%	79.00%
Target C ≥	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2218.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	498.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	721.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	172.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	247.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	498.00	2218.00	23.69%	34.00%	22.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1219.00	2218.00	61.45%	71.00%	54.96%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1638.00	2218.00	80.86%	88.00%	73.85%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of A Slippage**

Community colleges receive federal funding for students enrolled who successfully complete their approved programs. Most recently community colleges have changed their admission criteria by not accepting the Mississippi Occupational Diploma (MOD) and/or by limiting it to specific vocational programs. This has resulted in the noticed slippage of students enrolled in higher education.

**Explanation of B Slippage**

Community colleges receive federal funding for students enrolled who successfully complete their approved programs. Most recently community colleges have changed their admission criteria by not accepting the Mississippi Occupational Diploma (MOD) and/or by limiting it to specific vocational programs. This has resulted in the noticed slippage of students enrolled in higher education.

**Explanation of C Slippage**

## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Community colleges receive federal funding for students enrolled who successfully complete their approved programs. Most recently community colleges have changed their admission criteria by not accepting the Mississippi Occupational Diploma (MOD) and/or by limiting it to specific vocational programs. This has resulted in the noticed slippage of students enrolled in higher education.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	40.00%	100%	50.00%	66.67%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	3	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	7	null

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
3	7	100%	50.00%	42.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Slippage

Of the twelve (12) due processes filed in 2014-15, seven (7) resulted in successful resolution sessions. Of the remaining five, one went to mediation in lieu of the resolution session, one was dismissed by the hearing officer due to an insufficiency challenge; two resulted in no agreement at the resolution session (both were later withdrawn), and one was withdrawn prior to the 15 day resolution session.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 16: Mediation**

**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data		69.56%	76.10%	78.57%	76.92%	46.67%	62.50%	58.54%	86.36%	58.33%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**Indicator 16: Mediation**

**FFY 2014 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	1	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	9	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	10	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
1	9	10	58.33%	75.00%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Required Actions from FFY 2013

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

## Plan Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		48.00%
Data	37.50%	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### Explanation of Changes

The baseline had to be reset this year due to a change in the statewide assessment system. Please see our attachment for further details.

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	53.00%	58.00%	63.00%	68.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

### Description of Measure

Please reference our PDF

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference our PDF

### Overview

Please reference our PDF

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Data and Overview

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

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

#### Data Analysis

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

Please reference our PDF

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Data and Overview

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

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

#### **Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

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

Please reference our PDF

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

### Plan

#### Data and Overview

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

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

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

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

*Statement*

Please reference our PDF

*Description*

Please reference our PDF

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

### Plan

#### Data and Overview

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

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

#### **Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

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

Please reference our PDF

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Data and Overview

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

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

#### Theory of Action

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

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

#### Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please reference our PDF

#### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please reference our PDF

#### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please reference our PDF

#### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please reference our PDF

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Gretchen Cagle

Title: State Director of Special Educaiton

Email: gcagle@mde.k12.ms.us

Phone: 601-359-3498