

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part B**

for  
**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

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

146

#### 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 including on-site monitoring, desk audits, LEA self-assessments, LEA assurances;
- 2.) Data submissions to the SEA via Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS);
- 3.) Policies, Procedures and effective implementation reviews;
- 4.) State Performance Plan;
- 5.) Dispute Resolution via on-site investigations and desk audits;
- 6.) Targeted technical assistance and professional development through on-site visits, webinars, and coaching;
- 7.) Fiscal management via on-site investigations, desk audits and technical assistance.

#### 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 74.19, and evidence based best practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19 and to promote access to the general education curriculum as we work toward continued improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities. Technical assistance is provided through informal and formal methods. Staff in the Office of Special Education provide technical assistance on a daily basis through responsiveness to phone calls and emails from parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers regarding the requirements of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19 in the provision of services, implementation of programs and protections for students 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, targeted technical assistance that to address an identified area(s) need. Areas of need are identified at the State and local level through on-going review and analysis of data, collaboration with the Office of School Improvement and the implementation of the MDE Strategic Goals. 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 including but not limited to on-site monitoring, desk-audits, self-assessments, funding application review, data submissions, LEA Policy and Procedure reviews, and Formal State Complaints. Technical assistance needs are all identified through surveys or needs assessments completed by LEAs.

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 provide effective instruction to students with disabilities and to ensure administrators understand the requirements of implementing IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19. 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 MDE's vision, mission and strategic plan.

#### 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 74.19, and evidence-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19. 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.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement**

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

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

##### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

LEA performance data, the SPP, and other public reporting data, is located on the State's website at the following link:  
[http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSE/SPP\\_APR](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSE/SPP_APR)

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

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 the State's results driven accountability system and general supervision; the IDEA Data Center (IDC), and The Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), Brustein and Manasevit and The Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) regarding federal education regulations and legislative practices, specifically with funding sources and blending and braiding of federal funds; The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) and National Association State Directors of Education (NASDSE) networking with other states and their available resources.

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

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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 provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

#### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2006	22.87%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	71.00%	77.00%	77.00%	81.00%	38.78%
Data	22.50%	28.10%	33.60%	34.68%	36.39%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	43.18%	43.18%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY19 target is based on the feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,347
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,511
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	38.37%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,347	3,511	36.39%	43.18%	38.37%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.**

For FFY 18 graduation data, all students were required to meet requirements for graduation as set forth by the Mississippi State Board of Education. These requirements include earning a specified number of Carnegie Units depending on the type of diploma earned. These are laid out in Appendices A-1 through A-4 of the attached Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2018 and passing scores, or acceptable equivalents as defined by the State Board of Education in Appendix A-5 of the attached Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2018. These requirements are not different for students with disabilities.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

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

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2011	10.77%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data	9.35%	9.88%	9.25%	9.09%	9.72%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY19 target is based on the feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,359
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	1,239
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	8
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	326
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	6

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
326	2,938	9.72%	10.00%	11.10%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State has recently implemented a more rigorous set of College and Career Ready standards as well as more rigorous graduation requirements. These factors contributed to the increase in the State's dropout rate. The State is currently working with the MDE Office of Intervention and technical assistance centers to strengthen and implement interventions at the LEA level in order to decrease the drop out rate. Additionally, the MDE has developed the Access for All Guide (AFA) (<https://mdek12.org/sites/default/files/documents/OAE/OAE/2019-access-for-all-guide.pdf>) The AFA Guide was developed by the MDE in collaboration with educators across the state to help teachers address issues that impact learners with a wide variety of needs.

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

DEFINITION OF A DROPOUT A dropout is an individual who:

- (1) Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year;
- (2) Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year;
- (3) Has not graduated from high school or completed a State or District approved educational program; and
- (4) Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: Transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or District approved educational program; temporary absence due to suspension or school approved illness; or death.

For the purpose of monthly reporting, a student who was enrolled at some point during the month, has not met one of the exclusionary conditions listed above and is no longer attending school will be reported on the monthly attendance report as a dropout.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

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

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.00%	Actual	95.53%	92.20%	93.53%	97.65%	97.46%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.00%	Actual	95.46%	92.45%	94.14%	97.56%	97.30%

#### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY19 target is based on the feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,763	5,557	5,653	5,386	4,564	4,530		5,360			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,905	1,354	1,069	970	770	753		532			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,266	3,545	3,892	3,691	3,076	3,037		4,198			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	508	506	541	549	548	525		524			

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,763	5,557	5,653	5,386	4,564	4,525		4,984			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,728	1,320	1,049	973	775	751		550			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,426	3,577	3,905	3,676	3,061	3,033		3,781			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	504	505	541	544	548	527		477			

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	36,813	35,759	97.46%	95.00%	97.14%	Met Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	36,432	35,251	97.30%	95.00%	96.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Public reporting of assessment performance and participation can be accessed at [www.msdc.mdek12.org](http://www.msdc.mdek12.org) in a dynamic format. Detailed data, including counts of students with disabilities participating in assessments can be found at [www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr](http://www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr) under the Public Reporting and the link titled "2018-2019 Assessment Participation Data".

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

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2015	Target >=	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	17.90%	24.41%
A	Overall	11.39%	Actual	19.85%	12.08%	11.39%	9.31%	15.32%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2015	Target >=	54.00%	59.00%	63.00%	17.39%	23.97%
A	Overall	10.81%	Actual	28.38%	11.09%	10.81%	10.35%	17.06%

#### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	30.92%	30.92%
Math	A >=	Overall	30.55%	30.55%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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 FFY19 target is based on the feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

#### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**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	5,679	5,405	5,502	5,210	4,394	4,315		5,254			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	831	632	408	227	208	162		64			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	393	464	371	169	180	149		248			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	126	168	227	207	191	260		256			

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**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	5,658	5,402	5,495	5,193	4,384	4,311		4,808			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	908	648	344	336	279	194		107			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	562	523	328	360	304	232		349			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	201	201	306	186	235	235		135			

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,759	5,941	15.32%	30.92%	16.61%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,251	6,973	17.06%	30.55%	19.78%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

<https://msrc.mdek12.org/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**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

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

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its 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 that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	9.59%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	9.93%	9.40%	6.76%	9.59%	4.76%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY19 target is based on the feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	149	4.76%	0.00%	4.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (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

**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.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. The OSE has provides a checklist which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. A completed checklist must be submitted with the LEA response.

The MDE OSE identified 7 districts identified as having significant discrepancy in in FFY18 based on FFY 17 discipline data. Each district identified was required to review 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 2017, based on FFY 2016 discipline data. District's submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the district's 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. The MDE OSE reviewed each district's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices and that all districts implemented positive behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. The OSE has provides a checklist which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. A completed checklist must be submitted with the LEA response.

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

LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. The OSE has provides a checklist which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. A completed checklist must be submitted with the LEA response.

The MDE OSE identified 7 districts as having significant discrepancy in FFY17 based on FFY16 and in FFY18 based on FFY 17 discipline data. Each district identified was required to review the districts' current 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, for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2017, based on FFY 2016 discipline data. District's submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the district's 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. The MDE OSE reviewed each district's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices and that all districts implemented positive behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The failure to conduct the review required in 34 CFR §300.170(b) is noncompliance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report correction of this noncompliance by describing the review and, if appropriate, revision of 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 that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2017 based upon FFY 2016 discipline data, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. The OSE has provides a checklist which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. A completed checklist must be submitted with the LEA response.

The MDE OSE identified 7 districts identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY17 based on FFY16 adiscipline data. Each district identified was required to review 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 2017, based on FFY 2016 discipline data. District's submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the district's 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. The MDE OSE reviewed each district's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices and that all districts implemented positive behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA

#### **4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

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 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2018, based on FFY 2017 discipline data.

OSEP could not determine whether the State identified noncompliance in FFY 2017, based on FFY 2016 discipline data, through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). The State reported in the "Correction of Findings Identified in FFY 2017" table, it identified seven findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017 and verified correction of seven findings within one year. However, in the narrative the State reported, "MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices and that all districts implemented positive behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA."

The State must clarify, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, whether it identified noncompliance in FFY 2017, based on FFY 2016 discipline data, through the review of policies, procedures, and practices pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). If the State identified noncompliance through this review, the State must report in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2018 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

#### **4A - Required Actions**

The failure to conduct the review required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) is noncompliance. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report correction of this noncompliance by describing the review and, if appropriate, revision of 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 that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2018 based upon FFY 2017 discipline data, as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b).

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
-----	------	------

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
31	0	149	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

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:

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

The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2018 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.

A single year of data is used in the analysis and the minimum cell and n-size is 10.

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)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices. The OSE has

provides a checklist which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination including IEP implementation, Positive behavioral interventions and policies, procedures and practices. A completed checklist must be submitted with the LEA response.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	59.47%	59.97%	60.47%	60.97%	61.47%
A	54.82%	Data	67.20%	64.27%	63.02%	63.01%	65.28%
B	2005	Target <=	15.98%	15.48%	14.98%	14.48%	13.98%
B	21.88%	Data	13.33%	14.42%	15.10%	15.09%	13.89%
C	2005	Target <=	2.25%	2.18%	2.11%	2.04%	1.97%
C	1.92%	Data	2.07%	2.08%	2.01%	1.87%	1.92%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	61.97%	61.97%
Target B <=	13.48%	13.48%
Target C <=	1.90%	1.90%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY2019 Target is based on feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	61,172

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,988
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,475
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	515
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	158
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	478

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,988	61,172	65.28%	61.97%	70.27%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,475	61,172	13.89%	13.48%	12.22%	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]	1,151	61,172	1.92%	1.90%	1.88%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### 5 - Required Actions

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	64.80%	64.85%	64.90%	64.95%	65.00%
A	64.75%	Data	66.42%	65.71%	64.04%	62.49%	58.42%
B	2011	Target <=	15.02%	14.97%	14.92%	14.87%	14.82%
B	15.07%	Data	14.51%	13.52%	15.38%	16.93%	17.32%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	65.05%	65.05%
Target B <=	14.77%	14.77%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

FFY 2019 targets are based on feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,261

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	4,887
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,165
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	179
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	4,887	8,261	58.42%	65.05%	59.16%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,344	8,261	17.32%	14.77%	16.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target >=	56.99%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%
A1	56.99%	Data	56.99%	50.11%	55.64%	49.80%	48.25%

A2	2013	Target >=	81.74%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
A2	81.74%	Data	81.74%	76.12%	79.59%	78.44%	75.40%
B1	2013	Target >=	64.01%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
B1	64.01%	Data	64.01%	58.40%	61.19%	61.60%	53.54%
B2	2013	Target >=	74.37%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
B2	74.37%	Data	74.37%	70.42%	72.19%	72.43%	67.45%
C1	2013	Target >=	42.24%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%
C1	42.24%	Data	42.24%	33.26%	37.41%	38.06%	32.94%
C2	2013	Target >=	71.78%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
C2	71.78%	Data	71.78%	69.38%	70.68%	70.68%	64.90%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	62.00%	62.00%
Target A2 >=	87.00%	87.00%
Target B1 >=	69.00%	69.00%
Target B2 >=	79.00%	79.00%
Target C1 >=	47.00%	47.00%
Target C2 >=	77.00%	77.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

FFY2019 Targets are based on feedback from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

#### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,896

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	101	5.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	280	14.77%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	63	3.32%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	279	14.72%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,173	61.87%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the	342	723	48.25%	62.00%	47.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,452	1,896	75.40%	87.00%	76.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	55	2.90%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	336	17.72%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	162	8.54%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	449	23.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	894	47.15%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	611	1,002	53.54%	69.00%	60.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,343	1,896	67.45%	79.00%	70.83%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	61	3.22%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	412	21.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	104	5.49%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	212	11.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,107	58.39%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.	316	789	32.94%	47.00%	40.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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.	1,319	1,896	64.90%	77.00%	69.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

The Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-2) is a comprehensive assessment that is designed for children from birth through seven years. It was specifically developed for identification of children who may benefit from special services, ongoing progress monitoring, and outcomes assessments. The BDI-2 domains align to the 3 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) as follows:

ECO Outcome BDI-2 Domain

Positive social-emotional skills

Personal-social (including social relationships)

Acquiring and using knowledge and skills

Communication and cognitive

Taking appropriate action to meet needs

Adaptive and motor

For the (MAPS) report, children were placed in categories 1-7 based on the z-score for the outcome area. Each raw score was assigned a corresponding z-score. These z-score ranges were obtained from the guidelines posted on ECO's website on July 5, 2006. This document was titled "ECO Recommendations on Age-Expected Functioning and 2006 ECO Scale Points." The State is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF).

For the MAPS OSEP Outcome Report, children were placed in categories 1-5 (progress categories a-e in the measurement) based on their performance at Time 1 and Time 2. The category descriptions were taken from ECO Center's website [www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/assets/pdfs/OSEP\\_Sept\\_2006\\_TA\\_Document.pdf](http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/assets/pdfs/OSEP_Sept_2006_TA_Document.pdf).

The State defines "comparable to same-aged peers" as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COSF.

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

### 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	61.46%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	77.46%	79.46%	81.46%	83.46%	85.46%
Data	96.89%	98.83%	97.05%	97.19%	97.23%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	87.46%	

#### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
31,493	32,363	97.23%	87.46%	97.31%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

69,432

Percentage of respondent parents

46.61%

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

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.

MDE analyzed the survey data in comparison to all special education students to determine the representativeness of the survey results. In the area of gender, MDE found that the female group was underrepresented(-1.47% ) and the male group was overrepresented (1.47%).

In the area of race, the following races had overrepresentation:

Asian (0.02%),  
Black/African American (2.11%),  
Two or More Races (0.38%), and  
Native American (0.03%).

The following races had underrepresentation:

Hispanic/Latino (-0.31%),  
Pacific Islander(-0.01), and  
White (-2.23%).

In the area of disabilities, the following disabilities had underrepresentation:

Specific Learning Disability (-0.49%),  
Developmentally Delayed (-1.56%),  
Autism (-0.92%),  
Intellectual Disability (-0.02%),  
Traumatic Brain Injury (-0.05%),  
Visually Impaired (-0.01%), and  
Deaf-Blind (-0.04%).

The following disabilities had overrepresentation:

Language/Speech Impaired (0.46%),  
Emotional Disability (0.92%),  
Other Health Impairment (1.23%),  
Multiple Disabilities (0.34%), and  
Hearing Impaired (0.14%).

No area of review had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3%, and MDE OSE considers this to be acceptable representation of the special education population.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8 - OSEP Response**

**8 - Required Actions**

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

2

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 that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	144	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

**Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

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:

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

The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2017 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.

A single year of data is used in the analysis and the minimum cell and n-size is 10.

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.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

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)**

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

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 that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
12	0	145	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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: (# of non-Black ID students in the State / # 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, 2018 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.

A single year of data was used and the State's minimum cell and n-size is 10.

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.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Districts identified with disproportionality must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices contributed to the disproportionality. Whenever it is determined that disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the district.

The district must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district's determination that the disproportionality was or was not the result of inappropriate identification. The OSE has provides a self-assessment for disproportionality which includes a list of various types of information the district must review to make its determination. This completed self-assessment must be included in the district's response.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	70.92%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.91%	100.00%	99.74%	99.73%	99.96%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,244	10,239	99.96%	100%	99.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

5

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

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed ranged from \*8 days to 57\* days. The reasons for the delays includes the following:

1. Staff delays due to absences or turnover
2. Difficulty obtaining records
3. Parents not providing sufficient information

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

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, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Data for children for whom consent to conduct an initial evaluation was received during FFY 2018, but the timeline for completing the evaluation elapsed after the end of FFY 2018 were not included in the FFY 2018 data analysis and will be included in the FFY 2019 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 2018-2019 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 5: Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2018-2019 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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Failure to complete an initial evaluation and determine eligibility within 60 days of receiving parental consent to evaluate is a violation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A list of students whose timelines appear noncompliant was provided to LEAS. The LEA reviewed each student to determine if the data entered in MSIS was accurate. If the data was accurate, the LEA must determine why the eligibility was not determined and 60 calendar days of parental consent to evaluate. The only acceptable exceptions to the 60 day timeline, as outlined in IDEA 34 CFR §300.301(d), are: the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant time frame has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability, If the district cannot demonstrate 100% compliance after the response is reviewed, the OSE as required by IDEA, will issue a written finding of noncompliance and the district is required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification. Districts that receive written findings of noncompliance will be required to devise an improvement Plan and provide evidence of each student's documentation correcting noncompliance. The district must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of noncompliance and provide updated data and/or exceptions to the timeline. Explanations and documentation for each student found to be noncompliant are required for each student.

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

If the district cannot demonstrate 100% compliance after the response is reviewed, the OSE as required by IDEA, will issue a written finding of noncompliance and the district is required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification. Districts that receive written findings of noncompliance will be required to devise an improvement Plan and provide evidence of each student's documentation correcting noncompliance. The district must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of noncompliance and provide updated data and/or explanations for missed timelines. Explanations and documentation for each student found to be noncompliant are required for each student. The MDE OSE verified that the 4 cases identified as noncompliant were corrected by the district. Documentation of correction included the review of district policies and procedures, completed evaluations, and eligibility determinations that verify noncompliance correction (even though it was outside of the 60-day timeline) for each individual case of noncompliance.

In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the MDE OSE verifies that the identified noncompliance for each student has been corrected (evaluations completed, although late) and that the specific regulatory requirements are being correctly implemented through a review of updated data on a monthly basis using the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). The MDE OSE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and 2016 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The MDE OSE verified that each of the 59 cases of noncompliance was corrected unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and 28 uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Further, OSEP notes that there is a discrepancy between the number of findings identified in FFY 2017 the State reported in the narrative (59), and the number of findings identified in FFY 2017 reported in the table (4). In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must clarify the number of findings identified in FFY 2017, and describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	51.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.54%	95.49%	97.49%	58.54%	89.50%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	706
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	149
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	218

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.	319
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	9
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	218	229	89.50%	100%	95.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**  
11

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

Eleven (11) students were included in (a) but not b, c, d, e, or f. The days beyond the students' third birthday range from seventy-eight (78) days to two hundred eight-one (281) days. The reason for the delays include:

1. The district being unaware of the student
2. Unable to get information from parents
3. Staff illness

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

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, 2018 to June 30, 2019. 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 2018-2019 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 2018-2019 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 2018-2019 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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
59	59	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In order to verify correction of noncompliance, the district must demonstrate that it has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the OSE's review of updated data. The correction of individual cases of noncompliance for Indicator 12 is defined as completing any outstanding IEPs from SY 2018-2019 although late, and revising and implementing appropriate policy, procedures, and practices to ensure that IEPs are in place for eligible children referred by Part C to Part B by their third birthday.

If the review of data at that time still demonstrates missed timelines, the district will need to notify the OSE if those missed timelines were the result of one of the allowable exceptions. The only acceptable exceptions to the timeline, as outlined in IDEA 34 CFR § 300.301(d), are: The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant timeframe has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability.

The district must provide a written response to the OSE that includes a completed improvement plan, a copy of any revised policy, procedures, and practices, and evidence of implementation. The district will also be required to conduct monthly data and record reviews for a period of 6 months that will include a review of the status of any referrals from Part C to B for the previous month.

The district should submit an Improvement Plan that details its planned activities to revise and implement any policy, procedures, or practices. The Improvement Plan must also contain activities for the monthly evaluation data review and reporting to the OSE.

Any policies or procedures that are revised related to the noncompliance of this indicator must be submitted to the OSE for approval.

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

In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the OSE verifies that the identified noncompliance for each student identified as noncompliant, has been corrected (evaluations completed, although late) and that the specific regulatory requirements are being correctly implemented through a review of updated data on a monthly basis. The MDE OSE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFYs 2017 and 2016 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The MDE OSE verified that each of the 59 cases of noncompliance was corrected unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining 59 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and 51 uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Secondary transition: 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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2009	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.73%	99.98%	99.96%	99.93%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19,165	19,166	100.00%	100%	99.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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 2018-2019 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 and any IEPs that were not marked as compliant were sent to the OSE for review by Mississippi OSE staff for compliance

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

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

In FFY2016 the MDE OSE identified 13 individual cases on noncompliance with indicator 13. The MDE OSE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by reviewing updated IEPs to ensure that transition plans were included. The MDE OSE through onsite monitoring and data checkups verifies that LEAs with identified noncompliance are implementing specific regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

#### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	27.79%	28.79%
A	24.00%	Data	23.69%	22.45%	29.01%	27.79%	25.04%
B	2009	Target >=	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	67.12%	69.12%
B	61.00%	Data	61.45%	54.96%	66.78%	67.12%	60.79%
C	2009	Target >=	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	85.09%	87.09%
C	78.00%	Data	80.86%	73.85%	84.38%	85.09%	77.75%

### FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	29.79%	29.79%
Target B >=	69.12%	69.12%
Target C >=	89.09%	89.09%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

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.

The FFY 2019 Target is based on feedback received from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### FFY 2018 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	2,422
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	660
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	825
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)	137

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).	225
--	-----

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	660	2,422	25.04%	29.79%	27.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,485	2,422	60.79%	69.12%	61.31%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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)	1,847	2,422	77.75%	89.09%	76.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	Mississippi has not consistently has slippage in this area. The MDE is reviewing data and working with other agencies to determine the reason for the decrease in respondent youth enrolling in higher education, or in some other post secondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment. The MDE OSE plans to determine if there is a correlation between the increase in Drop-outs and this area. The MDE continues to seek improvement in accurately tracking and reporting the number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education and post secondary opportunities with one year of leaving high school as well as how it can improve services and supports to prepare and connect youth to higher education opportunities and post secondary opportunities.

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Was sampling used?	Yes / No
	NO

Was a survey used?	Yes / No
	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	Yes / No
	NO

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Overall, MS had a 89.5% response rate for Indicator 14. In the areas of Gender, Race, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 1 percentage point difference in respondents and leavers for any category. In the area of Exit Type, MS saw no greater than 3.0 percentage points difference in respondents and leavers for any category. Based on this data, MS has determined that the FFY 2018 data is representative of the population.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	Yes / No
	YES

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

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	15
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

FFY 2019 Targets are based on feedback received from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%		50.00%
Data	100.00%	42.86%	42.86%	20.00%	10.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	15	10.00%	50.00%	26.67%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	11
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through quarterly meetings with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

FFY 2019 target is based on feedback received from stakeholders during the development of the Mississippi State Performance Plan.

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	69.56%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	58.33%	100.00%	100.00%	86.96%	17.65%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	11	17.65%	75.00%	18.18%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**16 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

**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.**

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

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:**

Robin Lemonis

#### **Title:**

State Director of Special Education

#### **Email:**

rlemonis@mdek12.org

#### **Phone:**

601-359-3498

#### **Submitted on:**

04/30/20 7:58:01 PM