

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Mississippi



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

149

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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 and annual LEA Determinations;
- 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; and
- 8.) Cross-Office collaborative general supervision engagement

Technical Assistance System:

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

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 of 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. The model has been high 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 Office of Special Education. Professional Development, Statement 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 or the workforce.

The MDE Office of Special Education provides weekly Virtual Office Hours for Special Education Directors and their leadership team. These meetings provide LEA staff with important updates, reminders, and essential activities for the implementation of IDEA. In addition, this time is used to answer any relevant questions, provide leadership support, and build capacity. The MDE OSE provides a monthly community of practice for LEAs that are assessing more than 1% of their student population using the alternate assessment. The MDE OSE provides a monthly community of practice for those LEAs that are identified as having significant disproportionality and are required to reserve IDEA Part B 618 and 619 funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services.

In an effort to address teacher shortage, the MDE OSE has implemented and funds a new teacher mentoring program to support, coach, and build the capacity of new special education teachers in the field. The MDE OSE has also implemented a new special education director mentoring program to support, coach, and build the capacity of special education directors with 0-3 years. experience.

The MDE OSE makes numerous guidance documents available for LEA teachers and staff that support the improving outcomes for students with disabilities. These guidance documents can be found using this link: <https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/Information-for-School-Districts/Teacher-Resources>

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 children 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. The model has been high 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 Office of Special Education. Professional Development, Statement 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 or the workforce.

The MDE Office of Special Education provides weekly Virtual Office Hours for Special Education Directors and their leadership team. These meetings provide LEA staff with important updates, reminders, and essential activities for the implementation of IDEA. In addition, this time is used to answer any relevant questions, provide leadership support, and build capacity. The MDE OSE provides a monthly community of practice for LEAs that are assessing more than 1% of their student population using the alternate assessment. The MDE OSE provides a monthly community of practice for those LEAs that are identified as having significant disproportionality and are required to reserve IDEA Part B 618 and 619 funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services.

In an effort to address teacher shortage, the MDE OSE has implemented and funds a new teacher mentoring program to support, coach, and build the capacity of new special education teachers in the field. The MDE OSE has also implemented a new special education director mentoring program to support, coach, and build the capacity of special education directors with 0-3 years experience.

The MDE OSE makes numerous guidance documents available LEA teachers and staff that support the improving outcomes for students with disabilities. These guidance documents can be found using this link: <https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/Information-for-School-Districts/Teacher-Resources>

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

236

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the current and historical data. Based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

In person focus groups were held in regional LEAs to allow parents an opportunity to provide collaborative input. This also allowed them to advise on the reasonableness of the SiMR.

During MDE OSE's Virtual Office Hours, feedback was received from the State's Special Education Directors relevant to the proposed SiMR setting.

Meetings were held via zoom and in person for the Special Education Advisory Panel, and information was shared in order to obtain feedback and address any concerns around changes to the SiMR and Indicator data.

The MDE OSE provides continuous support to LEAs and parents through the MDE OSE, Office of Parent Engagement and Support.

The Office of Parent Engagement and Support hosted an annual Parent conference in a face-to-face setting. This Conference provided parents with multiple sessions designed to provide support for families of students with disabilities, increase knowledge of IDEA and its implications, and build the capacity of families to support and advocate for their students with disabilities. This conference also provides an opportunity for parents to provide feedback to the OSE.

The MDE OSE continues to provide a Family Guide to Special Education. This series has a guide dedicated to each IDEA eligibility category and is available on the MDE OSE website in the following languages: English, Arabic, Spanish, Vietnamese, Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, and Punjabi. The Family Guide to Special Education and other resources for parents can be found here: <https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/Information-for-Families/Resources>

The MDE OSE introduced two new resources for parents and teachers; A Compass to College (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/a_compass_to_college_preparation_2024_updated.pdf) and All Things Assessment (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/road_map_to_all_things_assessment_2024_updated.pdf).

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Stakeholder engagement meetings to solicit feedback were conducted throughout the 2022-2023 school year. All meetings were advertised MDE OSE website, and through list servers and public announcements.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The MDE OSE will make results of target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public by posting the SPP/APR to the Public Reporting page on the MDE OSE's website within 30 days of the final submission of the SPP/APR. The MDE OSE will also share the results of target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation with the Special Education Advisory Panel which is open to the public on ongoing basis throughout the year. Additionally, the MDE OSE will the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public through OSE Virtual Office Hours, The Annual Parent Conference, Monthly Virtual meetings for parents and stakeholders, the Annual Teacher Conference, and the Annual Special Education Mega-Conference.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

LEA performance data, the SPP, and other public reporting data is located on the MDE website at the following link: www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The MDE OSE has worked with the following technical assistance centers. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Data Center (IDEA) Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), Brustein and Manasevit, The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) State Collaboratives, WestEd, The Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center (CEEDAR Center) and The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). Based on collaborative work with each of these national technical assistance centers and organizations the MDE OSE has continued to strengthen its programmatic and fiscal monitoring systems to include results-based accountability and the implementation of a risk-based assessment. The MDE OSE has also worked with these centers to continue developing and implementing internal practices, procedures, and timelines. The MDE OSE has worked with DaSY to continuing to strengthen guidelines and practices for the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) during the first year of the implementation. Through work with the CEEDAR Center, the MDE OSE has developed implemented a Special Education Teacher mentoring program. Through work with NCSI, the MDE OSE has continued work to collaboratively with offices within the MDE Agency, particularly the MDE Office of School Improvement to improve outcomes for children and their families. The MDE OSE has worked extensively with WestEd, IDC, and CIFR to develop significant disproportionality guidance and CEIS guidance for LEAs in order to build capacity at the LEA level. The MDE OSE has also worked extensively with IDC to develop data processes and procedures for the Office of Data and Compliance within the MDE Office of Special Education.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, 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) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	42.15%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	38.78%	43.18%	43.18%	60.00%	62.00%
Data	36.39%	38.37%	42.15%	65.50%	66.15%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,345
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	112
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	390

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	8
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	398

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,345	3,253	66.15%	64.00%	72.09%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Students that graduated with a regular high school diploma were required to meet the 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 Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2022. These requirements are not different for students with disabilities. Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards can be found at the following link: https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2023_june_version_of_ms_public_accountability_0.pdf.

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

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	10.77%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data	9.72%	11.10%	13.05%	8.48%	13.14%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,345
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	112
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	390
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	8

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	398

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
398	3,253	13.14%	10.00%	12.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 point 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 LEA 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 LEA approved educational Programs; temporary absence due to suspension or school approved illness or death.

For the purpose 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

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	95.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	92.09%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	96.97%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	95.44%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	91.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	96.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	5,322	4,882	5,416
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	926	247	207
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	3,692	3,824	4,429
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	577	586	640

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	5,322	4,882	4,584
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	910	298	258
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	3,710	3,765	3,631
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	576	585	569

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,195	5,322	97.93%	97.00%	97.61%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,657	4,882	95.47%	97.00%	95.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,276	5,416	98.12%	97.00%	97.42%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,196	5,322	97.88%	97.00%	97.63%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,648	4,882	95.34%	97.00%	95.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4,458	4,584	97.85%	97.00%	97.25%	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 reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr under the heading "Public Reporting". Below are the links to 2022-2023 Assessment data:

- [assessment_participation_2022-2023_maap-a_0.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)
- [maap_assessment_proficiency_data_2022-2023.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)
- [maap-a_2022-2023_assessment_proficiency_data.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the school level. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

- Public Reporting of FFY2021 Assessment Data can be found at the following links:
- https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/21-22_maap_participation_updated_0.xlsx
 - https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted_08.03.23.xlsx
 - https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx
 - https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	16.22%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	8.19%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	7.78%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	15.12%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	8.58%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.42%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	23.00%	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	16.00%	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	16.00%	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	22.00%	24.00%	25.00%	25.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	4,618	4,071	4,636
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	533	77	40
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	598	328	470

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	4,620	4,063	3,889
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	582	96	116
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	777	480	1,022

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,131	4,618	18.34%	23.00%	24.49%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	405	4,071	9.17%	16.00%	9.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	510	4,636	11.75%	16.00%	11.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,359	4,620	21.80%	22.00%	29.42%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	576	4,063	13.12%	14.00%	14.18%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,138	3,889	32.35%	14.00%	29.26%	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 reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr under the heading "Public Reporting". Below are the links to 2022-2023 Assessment data:

[assessment_participation_2022-2023_maap-a_0.xlsx](#) (sharepoint.com)
[maap_assessment_proficiency_data_2022-2023.xlsx](#) (sharepoint.com)
[maap-a_2022-2023_assessment_proficiency_data.xlsx](#) (sharepoint.com)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, at the State, district and school levels. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr under the heading "Public Reporting". Below are the links to 2021-2022 Assessment data:

https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/21-22_maap_participation_updated_0.xlsx
https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted_08.03.23.xlsx
https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx
https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	34.15%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	48.38%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	52.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	36.63%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	41.68%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	31.03%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	577	586	640
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	142	284	286

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	576	585	569
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	187	226	196

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	142	577	27.93%	39.00%	24.61%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	284	586	47.39%	54.00%	48.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	286	640	42.44%	54.00%	44.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	187	576	32.10%	44.00%	32.47%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	226	585	34.90%	49.00%	38.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	196	569	28.93%	34.00%	34.45%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

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.

The MDE OSE provided updated links to public reports of assessment results. Public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr under the heading "Public Reporting". Below are the links to 2022-2023 Assessment data:

- [assessment_participation_2022-2023_maap-a_0.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)
- [maap_assessment_proficiency_data_2022-2023.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)
- [maap-a_2022-2023_assessment_proficiency_data.xlsx \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the school level. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr under the heading "Public Reporting". Below are the links to 2021-2022 Assessment data:

- https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/21-22_maap_participation_updated_0.xlsx
- https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted_08.03.23.xlsx
- https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx
- https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted_08.03.23_0.xlsx

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	20.99
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	27.40
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	27.01
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	18.11
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	25.68
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	25.72

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	15.00	13.00	11.00	9.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	29,591	34,171	37,623
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,618	4,071	4,636
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14,532	13,240	15,764
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,262	633	793
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	533	77	40
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	598	328	470

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	29,558	34,168	34,438
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,620	4,063	3,889
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	15,140	14,867	20,424
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,628	884	1,593
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	582	96	116
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	777	480	1,022

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	24.49%	53.37%	25.49	15.00	28.88	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.95%	40.60%	25.00	21.00	30.65	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	11.00%	44.01%	31.72	21.00	33.01	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	29.42%	56.73%	23.69	12.00	27.31	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	14.18%	46.10%	31.56	21.00	31.92	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	29.26%	63.93%	31.33	21.00	34.67	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

While the MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage, it is possible that increased truancy rates may contribute. A slight increase in truancy was identified following the return to in-person learning after school closures due to COVID-19. While they've begun to trend downwards, truancy rates are still significantly higher than what they were pre-pandemic. There are several efforts statewide to assist in the improvement of truancy rates.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not, as required by the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR, establish a baseline for 8th Grade Reading with accurate data and ensure its FFY 2025 target for 8th Grade Reading reflects improvement. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The FFY 2021 SPP/APR indicated that the 2020 data for Grade 8 Reading was 27.40. However the baseline data for Grade 8 Reading in the FFY2021 SPP/APR was recorded as 27.44. This was a data entry error. Grade 8 Reading baseline has been updated to 27.40.

3D - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline and targets for Grade 8 Reading in this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2016	9.59%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	4.76%	4.70%	10.27%	12.06%	0.70%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 4A data to review baseline data. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 4A, historical data for Indicator 4A and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the baseline data and determine if the FFY16 baseline data were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE will continue to use the FFY16 baseline data.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

3

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	147	0.70%	0.00%	0.00%	Met 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

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 suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities. 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. 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, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). The data pertaining to students with disabilities 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 students without disabilities is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in MSIS.

Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 students with disabilities for Indicator 4. N-size is based on the number of students (excludes 3-5/pk) in the child count for each district.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

11

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
23	0	139	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met 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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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 suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities. 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 from a racial/ethnic group in each LEA compared to the rates for non-disabled children in the same LEA. When significant discrepancy is determined for an LEA, the MDE OSE will require the LEA to conduct self-review of policies, practices, and procedures to determine if they contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Data on suspensions and expulsions is gathered from the State data base, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). The data pertaining to students with disabilities taken from the 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to students without disabilities is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and discipline records in MSIS. Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 students with disabilities. N-size is based on the number of students (excludes 3-5/pk) in the child count for each district and subgroup. Ex: Must have at least 10 Asian students in child count. 11 districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum n/cell size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

The LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies practices or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies practices and procedures and provides evidence to support the LEA's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, practices or procedures. The OSE provides a check list 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. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, practices or procedures 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 SEA identified 23 districts as having significant discrepancy in FFY22 based on FFY21 discipline data. Each LEA identified was required to review the LEA's policy, practices, and procedures 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 22 based on FFY21 discipline data. LEAs submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures 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 LEA's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs 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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b) was not corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

This required action is the result of a data entry error for FFY2019 and FFY2020. While there were LEAs identified with significant discrepancy in FFY2019 and FFY2020, it has been verified by the MDE OSE that the significant discrepancy identified was not the result of inappropriate policies practices or procedures. Nor was due to the lack of implementation of those policies practices or procedures. The MDE OSE verified this by reviewing the self-assessment checklists and evidence provided by LEAs.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	61.47%	61.97%	61.97%	77.00%	78.00%
A	77.52%	Data	65.28%	70.27%	76.42%	77.52%	78.82%
B	2020	Target <=	13.98%	13.48%	13.48%	13.00%	12.00%
B	11.47%	Data	13.89%	12.22%	11.22%	11.47%	11.35%
C	2020	Target <=	1.97%	1.90%	1.90%	1.00%	1.00%
C	1.70%	Data	1.92%	1.88%	1.90%	1.70%	1.56%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	80.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%
Target B <=	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	65,307

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52,032
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,421
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	295
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	52
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	392

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52,032	65,307	78.82%	80.00%	79.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,421	65,307	11.35%	11.00%	11.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	739	65,307	1.56%	1.00%	1.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

f

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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 ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	65.00%	65.05%	65.05%	60.00%	61.00%
A	Data	58.42%	59.16%	59.58%	45.04%	44.12%
B	Target <=	14.82%	14.77%	14.77%	16.00%	14.00%
B	Data	17.32%	16.27%	16.65%	24.96%	26.59%
C	Target <=				1.00%	1.00%
C	Data				0.95%	1.57%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	45.04%
B	2020	24.96%
C	2020	0.95%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target B <=	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	1,051	2,223	699	3,973
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	329	1,060	357	1,746
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	262	435	126	823
b2. Number of children attending separate school	44	93	24	161
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	23	27	5	55

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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	1,746	3,973	44.12%	62.00%	43.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	984	3,973	26.59%	13.00%	24.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	55	3,973	1.57%	1.00%	1.38%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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 3 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2013	Target >=	61.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
A1	56.99%	Data	48.25%	47.30%	50.00%	50.19%	85.71%

A2	2013	Target >=	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
A2	81.74%	Data	75.40%	76.58%	77.78%	75.82%	72.22%
B1	2013	Target >=	68.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
B1	64.01%	Data	53.54%	60.98%	60.82%	56.05%	94.12%
B2	2013	Target >=	78.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
B2	74.37%	Data	67.45%	70.83%	71.21%	68.54%	81.48%
C1	2013	Target >=	46.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
C1	42.24%	Data	32.94%	40.05%	39.47%	36.42%	82.05%
C2	2013	Target >=	76.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%
C2	71.78%	Data	64.90%	69.57%	70.72%	66.57%	72.22%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
Target A2 >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B1 >=	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
Target B2 >=	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
Target C1 >=	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
Target C2 >=	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

684

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9	1.32%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	28	4.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	96	14.04%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	165	24.12%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	386	56.43%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A,	261	298	85.71%	62.00%	87.58%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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>	551	684	72.22%	87.00%	80.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	16	2.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	52	7.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	141	20.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	247	36.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	228	33.33%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	388	456	94.12%	69.00%	85.09%	Met 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>	475	684	81.48%	79.00%	69.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	1.02%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	38	5.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	77	11.26%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	123	17.98%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	439	64.18%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	200	245	82.05%	47.00%	81.63%	Met 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	562	684	72.22%	77.00%	82.16%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B2	The MDE OSE cannot identify a singular reason for slippage in this area. However, contributing factors include, but are not limited to, a lack of Head Start facilities and/or staff and residual effects of lack of in-person instruction due to COVID-19.

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

The Battle Developmental Inventor 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 2 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) as follows:

- ECO Outcome BDI-2 domain
- Positive social-emotional skills
- persona-social (including social relationships)
- Acquiring and using knowledge and skills
- Communications and cognitive
- Taking appropriate action to meet needs
- Adaptive and motor

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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

Question	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 multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	96.47%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	85.46%	87.46%	87.46%	97.00%	97.00%
Data	97.23%	97.31%	96.47%	96.41%	95.52%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
27,857	29,146	95.52%	97.00%	95.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

69,280

Percentage of respondent parents

42.07%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	40.07%	42.07%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The threshold used to determine representativeness is a +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The MDE OSE used the following data to identify under/over representativeness:

GENDER

Males (-0.946%)

Female (0.946%).

RACE/ETHNICITY:

Native American (0.01%)

White (-4.28%).

Asian (0.08%),

Black/African American (2.56%),

Hispanic/Latino (0.23%),

Pacific Islander (0.08)

Two or More Races (1.41%).

DISABILITIES

Autism (-1.98%),

Deaf-Blind (-0.06%)

Developmentally Delayed (-0.74%),

Intellectual Disability (-0.01%),

Language/Speech Impaired (-0.95%),

Multiple Disabilities (-0.19%),

Other Health Impairment (-13.73%),

Specific Learning Disability (-0.15%)

Traumatic Brain Injury (-0.01%) and

Visually Impaired (-0.03%).

Emotional Disability (0.73%),

Hearing Impaired (0.09%), and

Orthopedic Impairment (17.05%).

Areas of review that had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than +/-3% are:

Orthopedic Impairment underrepresented by 17.05%

Other Health Impairment overrepresented by -13.73%

White overrepresented by 4.28%

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

The MDE OSE will continue to distribute the Parent Survey to LEA staff and allow multiple formats for parents to access the survey. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to the survey and work toward having all parents complete the survey, the MDE OSE will continue to work towards ensuring the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents and will continue to do so. In order to improve representativeness, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group. These reports will be made available in the spring semester as LEAs conduct ESY IEPs and annual IEP meetings. Additionally in the Spring, the MDE OSE will host a series of data analysis meetings with LEAs to analyze their parent survey participation and develop action plans to increase participation across a broad and representative cross-section of parents.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The survey used to collect this data are available to LEA staff only. LEA staff are trained to administer the survey to parents during on-site and virtual 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. In order to increase the response rate the MDE OSE sends weekly updates beginning in April to the special education director of each LEA. These updates provide directors with the percentage of participation for each district. Another step that has been taken to increase response rate is to allow the survey to be administered in multiple formats. LEAs can provide hard copies of the survey, verbally administer the survey or provide parents with the link to the survey online. These steps will continue to be implemented. In order to address underrepresentation, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

In analyzing the response rate the MDE OSE considered subgroups with under representation. The subgroup of responders of parents/guardians of students with orthopedic impairment was analyzed for non-response bias. While there was underrepresentation of this subgroup, bias was not identified as the response rate did not meet the +/- 3% threshold.

The MDE OSE will continue to distribute the Parent Survey to LEA staff and allow multiple formats for parents to access the survey. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to the survey and work toward having all parents complete the survey, the MDE OSE will continue to work towards ensuring the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents and will continue to do so. In order to address underrepresentation, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group. Additionally in the Spring, the MDE OSE will host a series of data analysis meetings with LEAs to analyze their parent survey participation and develop action plans to increase participation across a broad and representative cross-section of parents.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services using the metric of +/-3%. However, in its narrative, the State reported "Areas of review that had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3% are: Orthopedic Impairment overrepresented by 17.44%; Other Health Impairment underrepresented by -14.61%; Black/African American underrepresented by -3.33%; and White overrepresented by 4.30%". In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services using the metric of +/- 3% in the FFY2021 report was a data entry error. The State did have overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3% in the following areas: Orthopedic Impairment overrepresented by 17.44%; Other Health Impairment underrepresented by -14.61%; Black/African American underrepresented by -3.33%; and White overrepresented by 4.30%". As a result of this the MDE OSE has and will continue to distribute the Parent Survey to LEA staff and allow multiple formats for parents to access the survey. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to the survey and work toward having all parents complete the survey, the MDE OSE will continue to work towards ensuring the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents and will continue to do so. In order to address underrepresentation, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group. Additionally in the Spring, the MDE OSE will host a series of data analysis

meetings with LEAs to analyze their parent survey participation and develop action plans to increase participation across a broad and representative cross-section of parents.

8 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 the reporting year, 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	147	Not Valid and Reliable	0%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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:
 (# of Non-Black SWD in the State / # of Non-Black Students Enrolled in the State) * 100

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.

LEAs identified with disproportionality must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, practices, and/or procedures 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 LEA.

For the 3 LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, MDE required the district to provide written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, practices and procedures, and provides evidence to support the LEA's determination that the disproportionality was or was not the result of inappropriate identification. The OSE provided a self-assessment for disproportionality which includes a list of various types of information the district must review to make its determination. The completed assessment must be included in the LEA's response.

Based on its review of the data submitted in the self-assessment, for each of the 3 identified LEAs, MDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Valid and reliable data has been submitted in the FFY2022 SPP/APR

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 section 618 data for the reporting year, 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). 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 specific disability categories 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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.

5

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
13	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).

Data analysis was conducted 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, 2022 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. Five districts did not meet the minimum “n” size and were excluded from the calculation. 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.

For each of the 13 districts, MDE required the district to 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 provided 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.

Based on its review of the data submitted in the self assessment, for each of the 13 districts, MDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.92%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.96%	99.95%	98.08%	99.68%	99.71%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9,324	9,286	99.71%	100%	99.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

38

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 *1 days to 118* 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
4. Due to health and safety concerns related to COVID-19, there were school and classroom closures throughout the school year.

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, 2022 to June 30, 2023. Data for children for whom consent to conduct an initial evaluation was received during FFY 2021, but the timeline for completing the evaluation elapsed after the end of FFY 2022 were not included in the FFY 2022 data analysis and will be included in the FFY 2023 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 2022-2023 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, prior to the finding being issued (Prong 1) and has subsequent data, obtained from the LEA or through MSIS, demonstrating ongoing compliance (Prong 2).

Step 5: Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2022-2023 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
26	26	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to conduct monthly reviews of Indicator data for each LEA identified as noncompliant. A review of this updated data showed that all evaluation timelines were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

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

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of eligibility determination and/or IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and assessment team reports to the MDE OSE via SharePoint. MDE OSE reviewed the eligibility reports and additional supporting documentation (IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and Assessment Team reports) for each of the students to verify that even though the eligibility determination was beyond the 60 day timeline, eligibility had been determined by the LEA and noncompliance corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and eligibility could not be determined by the LEA, the LEA had to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State has reported on the status of noncompliance identified in FFY2021 and provided a description of the process by which the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance 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 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 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	51.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.50%	95.20%	80.53%	87.24%	53.91%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,346
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	103

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	706
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.	455
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	7
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	706	781	53.91%	100%	90.40%	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

75

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.

75 students were included in (a) but not b, c, d, e, or f. The days beyond the students' third birthday range from two (2) days to two hundred sixty-two (262) days. The reason for the delays include:

1. The district being unaware of the student
2. Unable to get information from parents
3. School closures due to COVID-19
4. Student was dismissed from Part C with no delays present
5. Referred to Part C but never received early intervention services due to lack of delay

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, 2022 to June 30, 2023. 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 2022-2023 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 already 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 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
365	365	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2021-2022 Month 03 Part C to B transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's Part C to B MSIS report showed that all timelines for students eligible for Part B services in Month 03 were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

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

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit via SharePoint eligibility determination and student IEPs, as evidence that the student had an IEP in place although it was after the student's 3rd birthday. The MDE OSE confirmed correction of noncompliance by reviewing eligibility determination and student IEPs and supporting documentation. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State has provided a report on the status of compliance for FFY 2021 and has provided a description of the process used to verify that each LEA with identified non compliance has corrected the noncompliance.

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, the State indicated that to verify the implementation of specific regulatory requirements, it reviewed "2021-2022 Month 3 Part C to B transition data", which is the same FFY in which the findings of noncompliance were identified. As a result, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 365 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2009	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	99.99%	99.73%	99.96%	99.96%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
20,947	20,953	99.96%	100%	99.97%	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.

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2022-2023 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non-compliant. A review of each non-compliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

Question	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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2023-24 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in the LEAs with identified non compliance in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of each student's IEP including a completed transition plan, although past the student's 14th birthday. The MDE OSE reviewed each transition plan using an Indicator 13 checklist to ensure all components of the transition plan were included. Once MDE reviewed each transition plan and verified that it met the requirements of the Indicator 13 checklist, noncompliance was considered corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	28.79%	29.79%	29.79%	26.00%	28.00%
A	25.81%	Data	25.04%	27.25%	25.81%	32.95%	35.27%
B	2019	Target >=	69.12%	69.12%	69.12%	61.00%	62.00%
B	60.09%	Data	60.79%	61.31%	60.09%	68.53%	72.44%
C	2019	Target >=	87.09%	89.09%	89.09%	75.00%	75.00%
C	74.27%	Data	77.75%	76.26%	74.27%	83.75%	85.78%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%
Target B >=	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%
Target C >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,226
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,885
Response Rate	84.68%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	653
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	698
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)	87
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).	201

Measure	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	653	1,885	35.27%	30.00%	34.64%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,351	1,885	72.44%	64.00%	71.67%	Met 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)	1,639	1,885	85.78%	75.00%	86.95%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: 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.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	88.57%	84.68%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The MDE OSE uses a +/-3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group to identify over/under representativeness. In the areas of Gender, Exit Type, LEP indicator, Race, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 2.5 percentage points difference in respondents and leavers for any category. Therefore, the MDE OSE considers the response data representative of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

GENDER

Female (0.27%)

Male (0.27%)

EXIT CODE

Dropped Out (2.46%)

Graduated with Regular High School Diploma (2.39%)

Graduated with Special High School Diploma (0.07%).

AGE

No students exited by Reaching Maximum Age.

RACE/ETHNICITY

Black/African American (1.81%),

Native American (0.02), and

Pacific Islander (0.04%).

Asian (0.06%),

White (1.75%),

Two or More Races (-0.01%), and

Hispanic/Latino (0.08%).

DISABILITIES

Orthopedic Impairment (0.01),

Specific Learning Disability (0.54%),

Visually Impaired (0.07%),

Language/Speech Impaired (0.09%),

Traumatic Brain Injury (0.05),

Hearing Impaired (0.10), and

Autism (0.12%).

Emotional Disability (0.38%),

Other Health Impairment (0.08%),

Intellectual Disability (0.48%), and

Multiple Disabilities (0.05%).

LEP INDICATOR

YLEP (0.04%)

NLEP (0.04%)

The response data is 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

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The MDE OSE will continue to encourage LEA staff to allow multiple formats for students and parents to provide Indicator 14 data. Additionally, the MDE will work to provide LEA data broken down by subgroup in order to allow LEAs to target under and over representation. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to data reports and work toward having all parents and students provide Indicator 14, the MDE OSE is confident that responsiveness will increase.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The MDE OSE will continue to encourage LEA staff to allow multiple formats for students and parents to provide Indicator 14 data. Additionally, the MDE will work to provide LEA data broken down by subgroup in order to allow LEAs to target under and over representation. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to data reports and work toward having all parents and students provide Indicator 14, the MDE OSE is confident that responsiveness will increase.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	

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 multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%	
Data	10.00%	26.67%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
		100.00%		Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State's IDEA Section 618 dispute resolution data are being suppressed due to data quality concerns. The IDEA Section 618 data are the data source for Part B SPP/APR Indicator 15. Therefore, the State's FFY 2022 data are also being suppressed under Indicator 15.

15 - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	

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 multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	69.56%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	
Data	17.65%	18.18%	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State's IDEA Section 618 dispute resolution data are being suppressed due to data quality concerns. The IDEA Section 618 data are the data source for Part B SPP/APR Indicator 16. Therefore, the State's FFY 2022 data are also being suppressed under Indicator 16.

The State did not indicate whether a target range was used and as a result, the FFY 2022 data table was not displayed.

16 - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must indicate whether a target range was used to ensure the data table is displayed.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The SiMR for the FY2022 reporting period was to increase the percentage of third grade students with a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) and Language/Speech (LS) rulings in targeted districts who score proficient or higher on the general statewide reading assessment to 32% by FFY 2025.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Grade three (3) students with disabilities who have an eligibility of SLD and LS.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/theory_of_action_logic_model.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014	16.00%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of 3rd graders with SLD and LS in targeted districts who passed the regular statewide ELA assessment	Number of 3rd graders with SLD and LS in targeted districts who took the regular statewide ELA assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
11	48	30.00%	26.00%	22.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

One contributing factor that may have led to slippage, is the fact that these students entered Kindergarten during COVID-19, and many may have completed kindergarten and, possibly first grade, virtually. Some students may have had academic struggles learning virtually and may not have had

consistent access to internet, especially in rural counties of the State. As a five- or six-year-old, sitting in front of a computer for several hours or managing technical issues could prevent learning from taking place. Some literacy foundational skills may have been missed because of how some students with disabilities learn and the need for additional support. Once students returned to in-person learning, some may have struggled to adjust to a classroom environment, making learning more difficult.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Data from the (MAAP) English Language Arts was analyzed. The Literacy Based Promotion Act (LBPA) was enacted to improve the reading skills of kindergarten through grade three students enrolled in public schools so that every student completing the 3rd grade is able to read at or above grade level. The Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) disaggregated grade 3 data for students with a Specific Learning Disability and Language Speech which included the number and percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the state ELA assessment.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) disaggregated the data into the following categories:

Percentage of students statewide who scored a level 4 or 5 on the grade three (3) MAAP ELA
Percentage of grade three (3) students STATEWIDE with an SLD and Speech/Language ruling who scored a level 4 or 5 on the MAAP ELA
Percentage of grade three (3) students in TARGETED DISTRICTS with an SLD and Speech/Language ruling who scored a level 4 or 5 on the MAAP ELA

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Mississippi districts are allowed to select an MDE approved Universal Reading Screener. The screeners are administered 3 times a year to provide a critical "first look" at the individual literacy needs of students. Screener data is used to target specific student deficits in reading. SSIP literacy coaches meet with teachers to analyze screener data, as well as progress monitoring data to help create plans for interventions. In addition, Learning Walks were conducted as an opportunity for administrators and the literacy coaches to obtain a brief snapshot of instruction and learning in the classroom. Observation data was collected using the MDE Learning Walk protocol which includes the following elements: 1) instruction (application of concepts), 2) instruction (instructional strategies), 3) classroom atmosphere and preparation/planning, 4) writing and literacy centers. This data was used to create a school literacy action plan to direct literacy supports to the school.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/Offices/MDE/OAE/OSE/SPP-APR/ssip_evaluation_activities.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The Mississippi State Board of Education Strategic Plan sets the roadmap for continually improving public education in Mississippi. Strategic Goal 1 states that All Students Proficient and Showing Growth in All Assessed Area and Goal 4 states that Every School Has Effective Teachers and Leaders. The MDE's coaching model has been an effective method of improving student achievement. MDE coaches build educators' instructional capacity across the curriculum, promote school-wide culture for learning that includes all stakeholders, enhance, and refine instruction and interventions, and target instructional coaching using the gradual release model.

A team of 112 coaches support teachers and school leaders in the areas of literacy, early childhood education, special education, school improvement, mathematics, and digital learning. The Offices of Elementary Education and Reading (OEER) and Special Education (OSE) serve a combined 60 school districts and 103 schools.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The MDE has invested pandemic relief funds to accelerate learning. An investment of \$10.7 million has been made to provide tutorial services through PAPER for students in grades 3-12 with access 24 hours a day, seven days a week. A total of \$23 million has been invested to provide digital subscriptions to districts to online K-12 learning resources. For the 2023 calendar year, the OSE has invested \$786,677.00 to train educators in Orton-Gillingham multisensory instruction using Phonics First®. The MDE Communications sent a News Release to educators across the State with the State Superintendent's 2022-23 Annual Report which can be found here. As a result of the investments the MDE has put into supporting districts, the following survey data were collected to see the outcomes of these improvement strategies below:

SSIP schools were asked to participate in a District/School Infrastructure Analysis Survey. Districts/Schools were asked to analyze the data to identify trends. The average of the respondents on a scale of 1-5 are as follows:

Educational Management & Leadership – 3.6
Professional Development – 3.3
Planning & Instruction – 3.5
Assessment – 3.6
IDEA Indicators – 3.3
District Level Support – 3.3

SSIP schools were asked to participate in a Literacy Instructional Capacity Survey. Districts/Schools were asked to analyze the data to identify immediate needs. The average of the respondents on a scale of 1-5 are as follows:

District/School Infrastructure Designed to Promote Literacy – 4.0
Professional Learning – 4.2
Professional Capacity – 4.2

SSIP districts/schools were asked to complete a District Survey. The average of the respondents on a scale of 1-5 in the area of literacy are as follows:
Prior to SSIP Participation, how would you rate core literacy instruction provided to all students in grades K-3 in my district? – 3.33
Prior to SSIP Participation, how would you rate your capacity as an instructional leader? – 3.67
Prior to SSIP Participation, how would you rate your district's capacity to meet the needs of students with disabilities? – 3.3

SSIP schools were asked to take The Teacher Knowledge of Early Literacy Survey (TKELS) which is an online survey of teacher knowledge of early literacy skills and includes questions related to the knowledge and application of teaching reading comprehension, fluency, writing and grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and phonological and phonemic awareness. In the fall of 2023, thirty-five (35) educators from seven Mississippi school districts completed TKELS testing. A mean scale score was results of the t-test indicated that the difference in the means of their scale score were not statistically significant for the following positions (K-3 Special Education Teachers 54.00 & K-3 General Education Teachers 54.04). Overall, there was no statistically significant difference in general education and special education teachers' mean scale scores. However, the differences in mean scale scores were statistically significant between respondents who attended at least one of the literacy trainings and respondents who indicated they had not attended a literacy training. Furthermore, t-test results indicated that the differences in mean scale scores of respondents who attended all three literacy trainings (i.e., LETRS I, LETRS II, and Phonics First® /Structures®) and respondents who had not attended literacy training were statistically significant. Also, the effect sizes for these results are large suggesting that literacy training has a substantial positive impact on TKELS scores.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The OSE will post several Request for Applications for additional SSIP Literacy Coaches, including one that will provide literacy Professional Development with an emphasis on students with disabilities in identified schools as well as across the State and one that will provide support to Language Speech Pathologists in identified schools as well as across the State. This support will encompass literacy training, scheduling issues, caseload, and any other areas of concern. This should provide more literacy training to educators as well as promote the idea of Speech Language Pathologists from working in silos and providing more speech services in the general education classroom, when appropriate. They will also be included in the surveys to provide input District/School Infrastructure and Literacy Capacity Surveys. The addition of more coaches will allow the MDE to identify more schools in need of literacy support.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Phonics First® courses offered by Brainspring
Professional Development Opportunities provided by the MDE

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Evidence-based Practices

Office of Special Education

School-based Professional Development provided by SSIP Literacy coaches:

Literacy Coaching in buildings for ALL teachers focus on the coaching cycle that includes observation, professional learning, modeling, feedback, and collaboration building. (Model lessons 260 opportunities, co-taught lessons 56 opportunities, coaching conferences 751 opportunities, administrator debriefing 304 opportunities.). Data analysis sessions were conducted that focus on identifying reading deficits and matching them to interventions, as well as how to implement interventions and progress monitor for success. High Quality Instructional Material sessions were facilitated that focused on the components of the reading materials and sessions were conducted for lesson planning and how to implement it. All school-based professional development is followed up with model lessons, co-teaching, co-planning, observation, and feedback (coaching cycle).

The MDE OSE SSIP Coaches participated and presented at the following conferences/meetings on the evidence based practices included in the SSIP.

Mississippi Council for Exceptional Children: Every Student Matters! Every Student is Exceptional!

The Time Is Right Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities: A Mega Conference:

The Science of Reading for Students with Disabilities:

Co-Teaching 101:

Building Partnership...Working Together Annual Parent Conference:

Back to the Future Transition Conference

Speech Language Professional Growth System Rubric- Deep Dive:

Phonics First® Trainings:

Annual Mississippi Literacy Association Conference: No Place Like Home

AIM Institute of Research and Learning – Pathways to Proficient Writing and Pathways to Literacy Leadership

Emerging Science of Reading Schools

Family Focus Nights

Elevate Teachers Conference

Teacher Leadership Opportunities, Joyful School Communities, Mental Health and Wellness, Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies, and Work Life Balance.

Building Inclusive Environments Workshop

Dyslexia Awareness Training online recorded sessions

Exceptional Children Chats: Designing and Implementing SDI virtual sessions

Intersection of IDEA & 504 training
School Improvement Convening: Urgency Rising Sessions
REACH MS Mississippi's State Personnel Development Grant operated by the University of Southern Mississippi's Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education funded by the MDE
REACH MS Webinars on Family Awareness
REACH MS Family Toolkit
REACH MS Webinars on Family Involvement

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Phonics First® is a thirty (30) hour course offered by Brainspring to instruct teachers in the use of multisensory literacy instructional strategies rooted in Orton-Gillingham methodology. Internationally accredited through both the International Dyslexia Association and the International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council, Phonics First® provides an evidence-based program that trains participants to deliver explicitly and systematically phonics-based, structured, multisensory, direct instruction to reach ALL students. Across the MDE, we have been able to deliver an array of literacy topics to teachers across the State. Teachers have access by means of webinars, in-person State trainings, Canvas courses, consortiums, and in-district trainings. By staying abreast of new researched-based literacy practices, we have been able to provide strategies and best practices to ALL teachers, which includes explicit literacy instruction. Parents have also been involved in Statewide meetings that give them access to literacy information, resources, and tools to use at home.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Reports are submitted to the building administrator and the MDE OSE. The coaches conduct observations and coaching at grade-level and/or school-wide. Professional Development is provided with the coach indicating the topics, audience, and number of participants. Monthly site visits are conducted to determine the effectiveness of literacy coach practices and what supports may be needed to enhance supports provided to the schools. Data Analysis is conducted based on data from universal screeners such as i-Ready and STAR Early Literacy, assessments, teacher-student ratio, etc. Survey data from Phonics First® will be collected to determine the effectiveness of the training and their ability to transfer the new knowledge into the classroom.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Universal screening assessments are administered to all students (K-12) at least (3) three times during the year to provide an especially critical "first look" at individual students. State statute requires that the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) "shall select early literacy and numeracy screening assessment instrument or instruments to be used throughout the state in the screening of students in Kindergarten through Grade 3" (Mississippi Code § 37-23-16; Mississippi Code § 37-177-5). Diagnostic Assessments are administered to students who fail the screening assessment. Diagnostic assessments provide in-depth information about individual student's particular strengths and needs for Tier 2 supplemental instruction and/or Tier 3 intensive intervention. Parents/Guardians of students in Kindergarten, First, Second, or Third Grade whose universal screener score indicates that the students' reading ability is below grade level and the student may need an additional diagnostic reading assessment to determine if a substantial reading deficiency exists receive a notification letter. Parents are notified quarterly (in writing) with each progress report until the reading deficiency is remediated. According to MS Code 37-177-1, students exhibiting a substantial reading deficiency at any time in grades K-3 MUST BE provided intensive reading interventions following the identification of the reading deficiency based on a diagnostic assessment. The intensive reading instruction and intervention must be documented for each student in an Individual Reading Plan.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Students will be administered Middle of the Year (MOY) and End of the Year (EOY) universal screener to evaluate if growth was made over time and determine what, if any, instructional interventions are warranted. The SSIP literacy coaches will conduct Winter Learning Walks to determine if teachers made instructional adjustments based on the Next Steps from the Fall Learning Walks. Phonics First® will continue to be provided to educators across the State to increase their capacity to effectively use evidence-based instructional practices. After reviewing the number of participants, the MDE will develop a plan to get more participation in the Phonics First® courses as well as determined the best locations across the State to have the trainings.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

In an effort to grow and improve the program and outcomes for students, data analysis was conducted on assessment data for grade three students in the previous identified eligibility categories plus Other Health Impairment (OHI). The data was shared with the SSIP Task Force group to gain input on how the State should proceed based on the data. The information was then shared with the Internal Task Force group to get additional feedback. The OSE then included districts and parents during Family Focus Nights to get feedback on their perceptions of the Districts' Infrastructure and the proposed revised SiMR. Stakeholder feedback was vital in determining if the revised SiMR was attainable and appropriate. Based on the analysis and feedback the MDE OSE will revise the SiMR to increase the percentage of grade three students with a Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Language/Speech rulings in targeted districts who pass the regular statewide reading assessment beginning in the FY2023 reporting period to 21.8% percent by FFY 2025.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. Because Indicator baseline and targets are based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report

data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The OSE has an External and Internal SSIP Task Force. The external stakeholders participated in a Carousel Around the State of MISSISSIPPI Making the Literacy Connection: Strong Readers, Strong Leaders. They engaged in activities such as analyzing data to inform the decision to revise the SiMR, determining the types of supports district could receive, school selection data points, and SSIP non-negotiables. The members engaged in an activity where they were put in groups and went around the room where they found data points on chart paper. They then included questions, concerns, or agreements on the chart paper. There was an SSIP coach at each chart to explain or answer any questions. Once the carousel was completed an open discussion was held. The Task Force determined recommendations/activities based on the information provided by the groups, which included if the State should increase the categories that the SiMR includes as well as what the measurable result would be. Family Focus Nights were conducted across the State in which parents were provided information about the SSIP via a PowerPoint presentation, which included a feedback portion where parents responded to questions/prompts, provided with literacy resources, and participated in a survey concerning the Districts' Infrastructure, as well as the possible revision of the SiMR. Of the respondents, 78% agreed with the revision of the SiMR and 88% agreed with including an additional eligibility category.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders had a concern about a 5% growth each year, but agreed once the data from previous years were analyzed. Historically, the data has been 3-5 percent above the target. Some stakeholders were concerned about services provided to their students, so an IEP Review was conducted to determine if students were receiving the most appropriate services. A debrief of the findings were conducted with district staff and a report was generated and provided.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

The MDE looked at scaling-up the implementation of the SSIP by determining if an additional eligibility category (OHI) should be included. Based on data analysis along with stakeholder engagement, the SiMR will be revised to include an additional eligibility category as well as revising the target. After a data analysis and several stakeholders and SSIP Task Force meetings, the revised SiMR is to increase the percentage of third grade students with a Specific Learning Disability (SLD), Other Health Impairment (OHI), and Language/Speech (LS) rulings in targeted districts who pass the general statewide reading assessment to 21.8% by FFY 2025. Although the percentage is far below the current SiMR, the data reflects the pass rate of students who were affected by entering Kindergarten during COVID 19. The State also determined that asking students with disabilities to perform at higher levels than students without disabilities was not appropriate. A revision will be made to move from proficiency at Levels 4 & 5 to passing at Levels 3, 4 & 5.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

FFY2025

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

N/A

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - 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:

Sharon Strong Coon

Title:

Office of Special Education, Director of Data and Compliance

Email:

scoon@mdek12.org

Phone:

6013593498

Submitted on:

04/25/24 5:12:20 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Mississippi 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
77.50%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	17	85.00%
Compliance	20	14	70.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	33%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	92%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	28%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	95%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	44%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	21%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	94%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	12	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	72	1

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.59%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	90.40%	NO	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.97%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	91.39%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	Not Valid and Reliable		0
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	Not Valid and Reliable		0
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Mississippi

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	0	0
16	0	0
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	24

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	0	2
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	24
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	47.52
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9139
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	91.39

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Mississippi

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.2) Complaints pending.	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	Not Valid and Reliable
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	Not Valid and Reliable

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.1) Mediations held.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.2) Mediations pending.	Not Valid and Reliable
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	Not Valid and Reliable

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	Not Valid and Reliable
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	Not Valid and Reliable

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	Not Valid and Reliable
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	Not Valid and Reliable

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

PartB-DR-002: $(1.1.b + 1.1.c) > 1.1$, PartB-DR-010: $3.1 > 3$, PartB-DR-009: $(3.2.a + 3.2.b) > 3.2$, PartB-DR-013: $4.1 > 4$

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Mississippi

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Raymond C. Morgigno
Interim State Superintendent of Education
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Dear Interim Superintendent Morgigno:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Mississippi needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Mississippi's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Mississippi's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Mississippi).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Mississippi's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Mississippi-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Mississippi's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Mississippi is required to take. The actions that Mississippi is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Mississippi's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Mississippi's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Mississippi's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Mississippi's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Mississippi's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Mississippi of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\)](#) | [OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Mississippi to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Mississippi should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Mississippi 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. We strongly encourage Mississippi to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Mississippi must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Mississippi received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Mississippi took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Mississippi must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Mississippi must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Mississippi on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Mississippi's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Mississippi must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Mississippi must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA’s website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Mississippi’s determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Mississippi’s efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Mississippi over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Mississippi Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.