



Mississippi Department of Education

IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Procedures

Programmatic Monitoring System Activities

As required by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), and aligned to OSEP QA 23-01, Integrated Monitoring Systems (IMS) processes are included in the General Supervision system of the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE). IMS implements a differentiated programmatic accountability and support system primarily focused accountability and effectiveness by ensuring Local Education Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA and develop and implement programs that improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. IMS includes the following four (4) levels of monitoring and integrates the programmatic and fiscal process for monitoring activities:

- Universal Monitoring;
- Cyclical Monitoring;
- Targeted Monitoring; and
- Intensive Risk-Based Monitoring.

Under Part B of the IDEA, MDE OSE is responsible for the general supervision of all educational programs for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each educational program administered by any other state or local agency (but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Indian children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior). This includes Section 619 (preschool) programs, public charter schools, children with disabilities residing in nursing homes, and educational programs in juvenile and adult correctional facilities (through the MDE Office of Compulsory Attendance Enforcement and Dropout Prevention). MDE OSE monitors the subrecipients of IDEA funds, which can include LEAs (traditional public school district or charter school) and programs operated by other State agencies. The subrecipients, in turn, are responsible for the general supervision of schools or programs within their jurisdiction. As part of monitoring an LEA, MDE OSE monitors compliance for any student placed by the LEA in a placement outside the LEA, including an Educable Child Facility, a university-based program, or a private school or program. Each LEA is responsible for the compliance and oversight of any out-of-district program in which a student is placed to ensure that it operates in accordance with all federal and state special education laws and regulations. MDE OSE reserves the right to identify any LEA for cyclical, intensive, or targeted monitoring at its discretion.

Universal Monitoring

Universal Monitoring activities are conducted in the daily functioning of the MDE OSE Office when providing service and support to the LEAs. The IMS Office collaborates with all MDE OSE offices and processes included in the universal monitoring activities to inform additional monitoring activities that may be needed to ensure LEA compliance, accountability, and effectiveness. Universal monitoring activities are conducted for all LEAs each year and include:

- IDEA project application assurances and review;
- State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Review (SPP/APR) data review;
- Annual Determinations;
- Dispute resolution; and
- Annual risk assessment.

IDEA Project Application

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

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

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

SPP/APR

Quarterly, the MDE OSE collects and reviews **SPP/APR data** from each LEA for compliance and results indicators using the information input into the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) by the LEAs. The quarterly data is shared with the integrated monitoring office to inform monitoring activities. The compliance and results indicators are listed for reference in Appendix A. Data are used for reporting in the SPP/APR, reporting to the public on the performance of each LEA, and to make annual LEA determinations. These processes are detailed in the Data and Reporting Procedures Manual.

In Mississippi, there are several mechanisms available to resolve **disputes and complaints**. These dispute resolution mechanisms include voluntary IEP facilitation, mediation, formal state complaint, due process hearings, and resolution sessions. The MDE OSE reviews the outcomes and findings of substantiated complaints and due process hearings. Where appropriate and required, MDE OSE issues findings, requires corrective actions, and verifies correction of noncompliance. Formal state complaints and due process data are tracked and shared with the integrated monitoring office quarterly to inform monitoring activities. MDE OSE ensures the identification of noncompliance and verification of correction for formal state complaints and due process hearings in accordance with IDEA requirements, and the specific details for those processes are documented in Volume III of MDE OSE's Procedures for State Board Policy 74.19 details Procedural Safeguards, Dispute Resolution, and Confidentiality.

Risk-Based Assessment

Each year, the MDE OSE completes programmatic and fiscal **Risk-Based Assessments** for each LEA based on criteria related to compliance with IDEA requirements, outcomes for students with disabilities, and the overall health of the school system. The tool assesses risk and differentiates levels of monitoring to identify and respond to emerging and emergency issues.

The programmatic risk-based assessment for all LEAs to determine their risk of potential noncompliance. LEA risk is calculated based on the collection of data from the following sources (see Appendix C):

- LEA School Improvement identifications;
- LEA annual determinations;
- LEA resolution of findings from dispute resolution processes within timelines;
- LEA performance on SPP/APR compliance indicators (11, 12, and 13);
- LEA correction of monitoring findings within timelines;
- Identification of significant disproportionality in the LEA; and
- LEA Special Education Director Experience (in the position for three or fewer years).

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

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

Programmatic and fiscal risk data are collected, compiled, scored, and analyzed to inform monitoring and technical assistance supports for LEAs (The fiscal risk components and rubric are included in Appendix C of the Fiscal Monitoring Procedures). Additionally, MDE OSE uses the results of the risk-based assessment to determine LEAs selected for cyclical monitoring on-site visits and intensive monitoring based on the LEAs combined programmatic and fiscal risk assessment scores.

Cyclical Monitoring

The MDE OSE conducts cyclical programmatic monitoring on the same five (5) year cycle. Cyclical monitoring ensures that the MDE OSE Programmatic Monitoring Team further monitors each LEA to examine LEA compliance with federal and state special education requirements related to priority areas at least once every five (5) years.

The LEAs identified for cyclical monitoring in a specific year are referred to as a cohort. LEAs are organized into cohorts by LEA type (regular school district or LEA charter school), size, geographical location, and financial data, including each LEA's MOE amount and the size of its IDEA Part B section 611 award to ensure a representative distribution of LEAs across cohorts. MDE OSE reserves the right to make changes to the LEA cohorts, groups within the cohorts, and monitoring activities as needed during the monitoring cycles, ensuring the revisions does not interfere with remaining in compliance with the MDE OSE monitoring procedures and IDEA requirements.

Cyclical monitoring activities occur each Fall, from August to December. The cyclical monitoring process includes the following activities:

- MDE-selected student sample representative of the LEAs students with disabilities population and data request (see the Identifying a Sample Section in Appendix D);
- Notification and training of the monitoring process and activities;
- LEA Self-assessment process;

- LEA data upload in the Special Education Navigator SharePoint online system;
- Monitor assignment and desk audit validation check of LEA data;
- On-site visit, classroom observations, and interviews (if selected for participation);
- Compilation and analysis of all monitoring data for compliance determination and report drafting;
- MDE OSE internal review, feedback, and approval process of report drafts;
- Issuance of compliance findings to the LEAs;
- Response opportunity and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) submission
- Technical assistance;
- Verification of individual and systemic correction and implementation of compliance requirements;
- Clearance report of noncompliant findings.

Although the cyclical monitoring schedule is publicly posted for each five (5) year cycle, the LEAs are separated into groups and provided with official notification of the upcoming self-assessment activity and monitoring activities and timelines with their respective groups within the cohort prior to the start of their monitoring activities. The MDE OSE also provides training for LEAs selected for cyclical monitoring prior to the start of their monitoring as well as on-going technical assistance throughout the monitoring process. Each LEA is required to complete an LEA self-assessment, and the self-assessment and all required documentation must be submitted to the MDE OSE no later than thirty (30) days from the date of the notification letter, with the exception of the MDE OSE's approval of an additional ten (10) day extension request that is available to LEAs in the event of emergency/unforeseen occurrences. The ten (10) day extension does not alter the issuance of compliance findings ninety (90) days from the LEAs data upload original due date.

Compliance findings reports are issued to the LEAs no later than ninety (90) days after the receipt of the LEA data in the MDE OSE online system. Following the issuance of reports of findings, LEAs are given thirty (30) days to submit a response to the findings and a CAP. MDE OSE provides technical assistance to the LEAs to ensure the CAPs submitted sufficiently addresses all areas of noncompliance and details the specific actions, persons responsible, and timelines proposed for ensuring correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one (1) year from the issuance of the findings report from the SEA. Additionally, MDE OSE tracks the corrective action timelines and maintains communication with the LEAs as TA to ensure data submission timelines are met for the verification of noncompliance within the requirements of the IDEA. Ongoing, general technical assistance is provided up to eight (8) months following the issuance of the findings reports to the LEAs, with intensive technical assistance being initiated and provided for the LEAs that have not submitted the required corrective action documentation for clearance beyond eight (8) months of non-correction.

Self-Assessment

The MDE OSE facilitates the opportunity for programmatic and fiscal self-assessment during the cyclical monitoring process as a method of analyzing the implementation of IDEA, which requires each LEA to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. Self-assessment offers a way to ensure transparency and understanding of the monitoring process and requirements and for LEAs to conduct an analysis and compliance determination of their special education program, including the review of policies, procedures, and student files and data to determine whether the system is achieving the intended outcomes for students with disabilities. The self-assessment process also allows LEAs the opportunity to begin improvement planning and actions prior to the MDE OSE compliance determinations. Although MDE OSE does not utilize the LEAs' self-assessment findings in the SEAs compliance determination or allow pre-correction, LEAs are encouraged to begin improvement actions following their self-assessment process and monitoring data submission to MDE OSE to ensure effective and compliant programs are providing FAPE to students and correction of

noncompliance, once issued by the SEA, are ready to be verified and cleared as soon as possible. There are seven (7) components of the programmatic self-assessment process (detailed in Appendix D):

- Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE);
- Child Find Initial (CFI) and Reevaluation (CFR);
- Individualized Education Program (IEP);
- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Secondary Transition (TRAN);
- Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE); and
- Discipline (DIS).

The FAPE and Child Find components include a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices in addition to student file reviews. The MDE OSE utilizes the MSIS and LEA student rosters to select a sample of students representative of the LEAs population of students with disabilities to be reviewed by the LEA during the self-assessment process and the MDE OSE during the monitoring verification process (detailed in Appendix E). In addition to the submission of policies, procedures, and student data, the LEA will submit to the MDE the self-assessed score sheets for each of the seven (7) components and the LEA Self-Monitoring Results Summary Form.

Desk Audit

Upon completion of the LEA self-assessment and data upload in the Special Education Navigator SharePoint online system, the MDE OSE's monitoring team conducts validation checks of the data submitted by the LEA for the MDE-selected sample of students to ensure accuracy and compliance, identify areas for additional training for individual LEAs and across the LEA cohort, issue findings of noncompliance when identified, and ensure individual and systemic correction and implementation of compliance requirements for clearance of noncompliant findings.

Monitoring teams of two (2) or more monitors are assigned by the Integrated Monitoring Systems Director to review the data submitted by each LEA and completes the following to be used in the compliance determination and verification of correction (Appendix E):

- Cyclical Monitoring Data Review Protocols with the same seven (7) review areas as the LEA's self-assessment (one (1) combined protocol);
- Monitoring Collaborative Review Feedback Form; and
- and Compliance Compilations.

No later than forty-five (45) days from the date assigned to begin the review, the monitoring teams must complete the review of assigned LEAs' data and submit the required compliance determination documentation to the Integrated Monitoring Systems Director. The Integrated Monitoring Systems Director assigns the compliance findings reports to be drafted from the reviewing monitors' documentation, submits the drafted report for the internal feedback review and approval process, and send the final compliance report to the LEAs via email. Each LEA within the cohort receives a desk audit, and in addition, at least 40% of the LEAs within the cohort are selected to participate in an on-site visit, as determined by the risk-based assessment or other factors. LEAs with highest risk scores within their group are selected to participate in

on-site visits for the verification of program implementation. The MDE OSE reserves the right to select LEAs to participate in on-site visits. Desk audits are only conducted for cyclical monitoring and verification of correction processes. Targeted and Intensive processes are conducted in on-site visits, except for additional data being requested by the SEA, uploaded to the SEAs online system by the LEA, reviewed remotely by the SEA, and added to the data collected during the on-site visit for compliance determination.

Targeted Monitoring

The MDE OSE conducts targeted programmatic and fiscal monitoring as needed and at any time during the year. Targeted monitoring is typically limited in scope to specific instances of frequent or systemic noncompliance in a singular area and is conducted using an on-site visit. The review of data during targeted monitoring is conducted using one (1) or more of the intensive monitoring protocol(s) for the identified targeted area(s), collaborative feedback, and compliance compilation. LEA data is collected and reviewed on-site during the targeted monitoring process, unless additional data is requested following the on-site visit, uploaded to the SEAs online system by the LEA, and reviewed remotely by the SEA. The purpose of targeted monitoring is to direct the provision of technical assistance from the MDE OSE to the LEA based on the area being targeted. LEAs can be identified for targeted monitoring through the general supervision team's bi-monthly review of data, substantiated credible allegations, universal monitoring activities, or if a specific area is identified during the cyclical monitoring process as needing additional attention. The targeted monitoring process includes the following activities:

- MDE-selected student sample representative of the LEAs students with disabilities population for the targeted area and data request;
- Notification of the monitoring process and activities;
- SEA and LEA targeted monitoring preparation meeting;
- On-site visit, classroom observations, and interviews;
- Review of LEA data by the monitoring team for compliance determination;
- Compilation and analysis of all monitoring data for compliance determination and report drafting;
- MDE OSE internal review, feedback, and approval process of report drafts;
- Issuance of compliance findings to the LEAs;
- Response opportunity and CAP submission;
- Targeted technical assistance;
- Verification of individual and systemic correction and implementation of compliance requirements; and
- Clearance report of noncompliant findings.

It should be noted that the MDE OSE reserves the right to implement cyclical or intensive monitoring based on findings during targeted monitoring.

Compliance findings reports are issued to the LEAs no later than ninety (90) days after the receipt of the LEA data during the on-site visit. Following the issuance of reports of findings, LEAs are given thirty (30) days to submit a response to the findings and a CAP. MDE OSE provides technical assistance to the LEAs to ensure the CAPs submitted sufficiently addresses all areas of noncompliance and details the specific actions, persons responsible, and timelines proposed for ensuring correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one (1) year from the issuance of the findings report from the SEA. Additionally, MDE OSE tracks the corrective action timelines and maintains communication with the LEAs as TA to ensure data submission timelines are met for the verification of noncompliance within the requirements of

the IDEA. Ongoing, general technical assistance is provided up to eight (8) months following the issuance of the findings reports to the LEAs, with intensive technical assistance being initiated and provided for the LEAs that have not submitted the required corrective action documentation for clearance beyond eight (8) months of non-correction.

Intensive Monitoring

The purpose of intensive monitoring of LEAs with identified high-risk factors is to determine compliance with federal and state laws for serving students with disabilities, direct the provision of technical assistance from the MDE OSE to the LEA, and assist the LEA in developing a continuous improvement process. Intensive monitoring activities occur each Spring, from January to May.

The data of LEAs identified with extremely high risk or the LEAs with the top 10 highest risk assessment scores, is discussed by the general supervision team and determinations of LEAs that will participate in intensive monitoring activities are made by the team, which includes an on-site visit. LEA data is collected and reviewed on-site during the intensive monitoring process, unless additional data is requested following the on-site visit, uploaded to the SEAs online system by the LEA, and reviewed remotely by the SEA. While MDE does not make risk-based assessment scores publicly available, the MDE OSE sends each LEA identified for intensive monitoring its final risk score.

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

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

There are five (5) intensive review areas and individual protocols (Appendix F):

- Policies and Procedures;
- Child Find Initial;
- Reevaluation;
- Delivery of Services; and
- Discipline.

Each LEA selected for intensive monitoring receives a notification letter at least fifteen (15) days prior to the on-site visit with an overview of the site visit protocols and documents that will be reviewed. Following notification, the intensive monitoring process includes the following activities:

- MDE-selected student sample representative of the LEAs students with disabilities population for the targeted area and data request;
- Notification of the monitoring process and activities;
- SEA and LEA intensive monitoring preparation meeting;
- On-site visit, classroom observations, and interviews;
- Review of LEA data by the monitoring team for compliance determination;
- Compilation and analysis of all monitoring data for compliance determination and report drafting;
- MDE OSE internal review, feedback, and approval process of report drafts;
- Issuance of compliance findings to the LEAs;
- Response opportunity and CAP submission
- Intensive technical assistance;
- Verification of individual and systemic correction and implementation of compliance requirements;

- Clearance report of noncompliant findings.

Compliance findings reports are issued to the LEAs no later than ninety (90) days after the receipt of the LEA data during the on-site visit. Following the issuance of reports of findings, LEAs are given thirty (30) days to submit a response to the findings and a CAP. MDE OSE provides technical assistance to the LEAs to ensure the CAPs submitted sufficiently addresses all areas of noncompliance and details the specific actions, persons responsible, and timelines proposed for ensuring correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one (1) year from the issuance of the findings report from the SEA. Additionally, MDE OSE tracks the corrective action timelines and maintains communication with the LEAs as TA to ensure data submission timelines are met for the verification of noncompliance within the requirements of the IDEA. Ongoing, general technical assistance is provided up to eight (8) months following the issuance of the findings reports to the LEAs, with intensive technical assistance being initiated and provided for the LEAs that have not submitted the required corrective action documentation for clearance beyond eight (8) months of non-correction.

Data Review

Individual and subsequent data submitted by the LEAs in the SEA's online data system for cyclical, targeted, and intensive monitoring processes will include review by the monitoring team for monitoring validation checks, analysis, compliance determination, and verification of correction. The SEA's data request to the LEAs for review can include multiple years of data and can include the following data sources:

- Student Individualized Education Programs (IEPs);
- Student IEP reports of progress;
- Student grade reports;
- Student attendance reports;
- Student discipline reports;
- Student discipline records (Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs), Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), and Multidisciplinary Determination Review (MDR) documentation)
- Student Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs);
- Student class schedules and transcripts;
- LEA policies and procedures;
- And other LEA and student specific documentation that is collected and maintained by the LEA.

The LEAs are informed by the SEA of the type of data sources that will be requested by the SEA for their monitoring activity in training, preparation meetings, notification letters, and official data requests. Data requests information is communicated to the LEAs by the SEA in-person, by telephone, virtual platforms, online systems, and email (ensuring students' identifying or confidential information is not exposed to unauthorized parties).

Interviews and Additional Information

Cyclical, targeted, and intensive monitoring processes may include requests for interviews or additional information based on the monitoring team's validation checks and may occur at any time during the initial monitoring process for compliance determination, on-site visit process, and follow-up process for verification of individual and systemic correction. Interviews are conducted in-person or by telephone using IMS interview forms and may include LEA district office staff, school administrators, special education teachers, general education teachers, related services providers, and any other LEA staff member that is relative to the monitoring compliance review area and student data. Interview protocols are completed by the monitoring team, used in the data analysis for compliance determination, and maintained in the LEA monitoring file. Additional information for student file reviews and monitoring compliance determinations may also be requested at any time during the monitoring process through clearance. Additional information can include requests for additional documentation for students included in the initial monitoring sample or requests for additional students and their records to be added to the LEAs monitoring sample. All additional information requests are documented, used in data analysis for compliance determination, and maintained in the LEA

monitoring file.

On-Site Monitoring

On-site monitoring will be conducted for cyclical, targeted, and intensive processes and can occur during the initial monitoring and follow-up processes. Data (observations, interviews, student data, and other LEA data) collected during on-site visits are used in the compliance determination and verification of correction processes and maintained in the MDE OSE monitoring files.

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

- Notification of the on-site visit;
- Entrance Meeting – The MDE OSE monitoring team provides a description of the scope and purpose of the monitoring, requests additional information from the LEA, and verifies the information required to complete the monitoring visit is available at the site;
- Detailed File Review – The LEA and MDE OSE Program Monitoring teams conduct a detailed review of an MDE-selected sample of student files;
- Interviews – The MDE OSE monitoring team interviews key staff who are knowledgeable and experienced in priority areas and parents;
- Classroom Observations – The MDE OSE monitoring team will visit schools and classrooms verify implementation of special education and related services in accordance with student IEPs in the least restrictive environment and observe any promising practices occurring in schools, documenting observations using the observation forms;
- Review of Policies and Procedures – The MDE OSE monitoring team may review LEA policies and procedures to identify areas for improvement in the LEA's program and practices that may be contributing to noncompliance;
- Exit interview – The MDE OSE team holds an exit interview with appropriate LEA staff when the monitoring visit is completed. Problem areas are discussed in general terms;
- Follow-up communication- The MDE OSE will send correspondence to recap the visit, request additional information, and provide guidance about the next steps in the process; and
- Review of Additional MDE-selected student files- The MDE OSE will request the files to review for any student observed during the on-site visit that was not initially included in the student population sample.

Monitoring Report

Following MDE OSE's validation of the LEAs submitted data during cyclical, targeted, and intensive monitoring activities, compliance finding reports are issued to the LEAs no later than ninety (90) days from the receipt of the LEA data in the MDE OSE online system for cyclical, targeted, and intensive monitoring processes. The report includes:

- A description of the identified noncompliance;
- The statutory or regulatory IDEA requirement(s) with which the LEA or EIS program or provider is in noncompliance;
- A description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (i.e., information, supporting the State's conclusion that there is noncompliance);
- A statement that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year from the date of the State's written notification of noncompliance;
- Any required corrective action(s); and
- A timeline for submission of a corrective action plan or evidence of correction.

Each finding of noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but no later than one (1) year from the date of identification. The MDE OSE may establish shorter timelines for correction. MDE OSE offers a follow-up call with each LEA to review the report to ensure

understanding of findings and sufficiency of correction. LEAs are offered a CAP/follow-up training and are required to submit a detailed CAP, including specific steps to be taken and an associated timeline to resolve noncompliance by submitting data demonstrating individual correction and systemic improvement.

Verification of Correction of Noncompliance

Pursuant to Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) QA 23-01, the MDE OSE verifies correction of each finding of noncompliance, verifying that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data and information, such as data and information subsequently collected through integrated monitoring activities or the State's data system, including correction of individual findings and the review of subsequent data demonstrating systemic compliance. Additionally, MDE OSE tracks the corrective action timelines and maintains communication with the LEAs as TA to ensure data submission timelines are met for the verification of noncompliance within the requirements of the IDEA. Ongoing, general technical assistance is provided up to eight (8) months following the issuance of the findings reports to the LEAs, with intensive technical assistance being initiated and provided for the LEAs that have not submitted the required corrective action documentation for clearance beyond eight (8) months of non-correction. If an LEA does not correct identified noncompliance within one (1) year of the notification of a finding, MDE OSE takes additional action to ensure correction.

Incentive and Enforcement Mechanisms

MDE OSE's Results Driven Accountability system includes a system of incentives and sanctions. Each LEA has thirty (30) days to respond in writing to the monitoring findings and submit a CAP. If an LEA does not respond or take action to correct identified noncompliance within a reasonable time, as required, the MDE OSE will take additional action. Potential MDE OSE incentive and enforcement options available to use with the LEA include:

- Technical assistance based on LEA's specific area(s) of need;
- Decreased reporting requirements when noncompliance is corrected in a shorter timeline;
- Recognition of timely correction through points added to determinations or risk assessment scores;
- Additional on-site monitoring;
- Special conditions on the LEA's IDEA subgrant awards;
- Directing the use of or withholding IDEA funds;
- Accreditation actions and sanctions; and
- State takeover with state oversight.

Programmatic Technical Assistance

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

Universal

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

Cyclical

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

Targeted

MDE OSE provides targeted technical assistance to LEAs with identified targeted areas of noncompliance to ensure proper corrective action and compliance with federal and state statutes and regulations. Targeted technical assistance can include scheduled calls, virtual or in-person meetings, training, and other assistance as needed depending on the targeted area.

Intensive

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

Appendices

Appendix A: Part B SPP/APR Indicators

[Appendix B: OSEP QA 23-01](#)

Appendix C: Risk-Based Assessment Rubric

Appendix D: Self-Assessment Protocol

Appendix E: Cyclical Monitoring Protocol

Appendix F: Intensive Monitoring Protocols

Appendix A: Part B SPP/APR Indicators

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

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

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

Appendix C: Risk-Based Assessment Rubric

Indicator	Scoring
Were any schools in the LEA identified as Targeted Support and Improvement School (TSI)?	No schools were identified: 0 At least one school has been identified as TSI: 5 At least one school has been identified as TSI for Students with Disabilities: 10
Were any schools in the LEA identified as an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement School (ATSI)?	No schools were identified: 0 At least one school has been identified as ATSI: 5 At least one school has been identified as ATSI for Students with Disabilities: 10
Did the LEA meet requirements for its Special Education Performance Determination Report? Most recent data is available.	Meets Expectations: 0 Needs assistance (3+ years): 5 Needs intervention (3+ years): 10 Needs substantial intervention: 15
Did the LEA resolve findings from parent complaints within timelines?	0 unresolved complaints: 0 1 unresolved complaint: 5 2 unresolved complaints: 10 3 or more unresolved complaints: 15
Did the LEA meet state targets for SPED compliance indicators (11, 12, and 13)? Most recent data is available.	Met 3 out of 3 indicators: 0 Met 2 out of 3 indicators: 5 Met 1 out of 3 indicators: 10 Met 0 out of 3 indicators: 15 Has long standing noncompliance for one or more indicators (more than 1 year without correction): 5
Did the LEA have unresolved monitoring findings for more than 1 year based on the most recent monitoring data? Includes all monitoring activities.	No - 0 Yes - 10
Has the LEA been identified as having significant disproportionality?	No - 0 Yes - 10
Has the LEA Director of Special Education been in the position for three years or less?	No - 0 Yes - 10

The criteria for risk may be adjusted each year to reflect MDE OSE priorities or new learning. Based on the annual risk assessment score, each LEA is classified into a risk category, with thresholds established based on the annual review of the data, using the following as a guideline:

- Low risk – 90 or above
- Medium risk – 71-89 points
- High risk – 51-70 points
- Extremely High risk – 50 points and below

APPENDIX D:
PROGRAMMATIC CYCLICAL
MONITORING
SELF-ASSESSMENT



Mississippi Department of Education

IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Self-Assessment

District Name:	
Special Education Director Name:	
Date:	
Cyclical Year:	

August 2025

Self-Assessment Team Documentation

Document the members of the LEA self-assessment team in the chart below.

Self-Assessment Team Member Names	Title/Role

Appendix C: Cyclical Monitoring Protocol

INTRODUCTION

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

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

Components

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

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

Citations

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

Planning and Preparation

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

Activities

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

Identifying a Sample

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

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

Selection Criteria:

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

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

The sample will also include, to the extent possible:

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

In an effort to explore the impact of noncompliance on outcomes for students with disabilities, the sample may include:

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

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

Self-assessment Student List

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

To determine which student files will be reviewed for the Child Find, Transition, Early Childhood Special Education and Discipline components, use the following guidelines:

- Files indicated as "Students in SC Settings" - review for FAPE-2;
- Files indicated as "Initial Evaluation" - review for Child Find 1-2;
- Files indicated as "Reevaluation" - review for Child Find Reevaluation 1;
- Files indicated as "Age 14 and Older" - review for Transition 1-6;
- Files indicated as "Part C to B" - review for Early Childhood Special Education 1-4; and
- Files indicated as "Discipline Removals" - review for Discipline 1-6.

These guidelines are to be used to identify which student files were reviewed for the each of the seven (7) components:

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

Student File Organization

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

Understanding Compliance and Correction

Documentation and Evidence

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

Addressing Evidence of Implementation

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

Correction of Noncompliance

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

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

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

Submission of Results

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

Compliance Audits and Identification of Overarching Training Needs

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

SELF-ASSESSMENT TEAM CHECKLIST

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

COMPONENT A: FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION

Understanding Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE):

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

An LEA's FAPE policies and procedures must ensure the following:

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

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

Instructions for the Review:

The FAPE procedural review should follow the steps below:

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

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the following provisions of a FAPE for students with disabilities? Is there evidence that the LEA consistently follows the process? A. Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers (i.e. buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers). B. Students with a shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement on the IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents/guardians. C. Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.	FAPE-3 A. & B. • Board approved policies • Procedure Manual • School Master Schedule • IEP PLAAFP • IEP LRE section • IEP Transportation section • IEP Progress Monitoring • Report Cards • School Bell Schedule • Bus Schedules • Interviews FAPE-3 C. • Board approved policies • Procedure Manual • Attendance Report • Discipline Report • IEPs • IEP Progress Monitoring • Report Cards • Interviews
RESULT & COMPLIANCE/EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES* ☐ Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers or have justification of the shortened school day in their IEPs. ☐ Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services. ☐ The public agency has documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures that address A, B, and C. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ NO* ☐ Transportation/ school schedules indicate arrival and departure times that are not comparable to non-disabled students with no justifications in their IEPs. ☐ Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days do not receive special education and/or related services. *Either of the above may indicate noncompliance and ☐ The public agency does not have documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures that address A, B, and C.

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

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

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

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

INFORMATION
LEA Name:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

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

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

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

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

Student Number	FAPE-2 §300.108

COMPONENT B: CHILD FIND B: CHILD FIND

Understanding Child Find (CF):

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

An LEA’s Child Find policies and procedures must ensure the following:

- Measures to identify, locate, and evaluate all students with disabilities, regardless of the severity of the disability; and
- Procedures to determine which students will receive special education and related services.

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

Instructions for the Review:

The Child Find procedural review should follow the steps below:

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

on the Results Summary Form.

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

CHILD FIND (CF)

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

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

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

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

RESULT & COMPLIANCE/EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ Yes* ☐ Child Find procedures are followed consistently when receiving and documenting written and verbal requests for a comprehensive evaluation from parents. ☐ A written process is established for implementing Child Find activities and there is evidence of implementation.	☐ No* ☐ Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are non-existent, insufficient, or inconsistent with IDEA. ☐ Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are not followed, resulting in a failure to document requests received and/or respond to requests in a timely manner.
☐ Policies and procedures address handling Child Find at times when school is not in session; procedures are not limited by a total number per year. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	*Either of the above may indicate noncompliance.

CHILD FIND REEVALUATION (CFR)

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

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

Group Discussion Questions:

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

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

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

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

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

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

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

COMPONENT C: INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

Understanding Individualized Education Program (IEP):

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

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

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

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

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

intervention plan with the LEA.

Instructions for the IEP Review:

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

COMPONENT C – Individualized Education Program (IEP)

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP include annual measurable goals that address the student's academic area of need? A measurable annual goal must contain the following: • Clearly defined behavior: the specific action the student will be expected to perform. • The condition (situation, setting, or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed. • Performance Criteria describing the skill and level of performance that will be achieved in the IEP year.	• Evaluation results • IEP committee recommendations • Consideration of special factors • Measurable annual goals • Examples of methods of measurement
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The IEP includes measurable goals and services that are related to the annual goals.	☐ NO The IEP does not contain annual goals, or the goals fail to address the student's needs as identified in the IEP and evaluation results.

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP indicate the amount, duration, and location where specially designed instruction and other IEP services will occur?	• IEP • Program services • Placement determination checklist • Statement of specifically designed instruction
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The IEP specifically identifies amount, duration, and location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services.	☐ NO The IEP does not specify the amount, duration, and/or location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services.

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP identify related services that address the needs of the student and support annual goals? <i>(Related services: developmental, corrective, and other supportive services as are required to assist a student with a disability to benefit from special education, including but not limited to the following services: speech-language pathology and audiology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility, school health and nursing services, psychological services, social work services, etc.)</i>	• Program services • Placement determination checklist • Examples of method of measurement • Educational need areas
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The IEP specifically identifies related services that align with the needs of the student and support achievement of annual goals, when necessary.	☐ NO The IEP does not specify related services that align with the needs of the student or support annual goals. There is no evidence to support the delivery of related services. ☐ NOT APPLICABLE The IEP committee determined the child does not require related services.

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP indicate student participation in the annual statewide assessment?	• Documentation of assessment results • Statewide assessment results • Eligibility criteria checklists, where applicable • Other relevant information
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The IEP indicates that the student will participate in a statewide assessment. If the student is participating in an alternate assessment, the IEP indicates the reason. The IEP includes accommodations and/or modifications for participation, if necessary.	☐ NO The IEP does not address the student's participation in a statewide assessment and/or the IEP does not include justification as to why an alternate assessment is appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION	
If the IEP was amended, did the LEA follow the procedures and notice requirements for making changes to the IEP?	• Prior Written Notice (PWN) • Amended IEP	
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION		
☐ YES The IEP Committee may review data about the child’s performance collaboratively and make minor changes to the IEP without a formal IEP Committee meeting. If a meeting is not held, each IEP Committee member, including the parent, must be given the opportunity to review all existing data and information. If the IEP needs corrections or minor changes between annual meetings, the IEP Committee may agree to amend the IEP without a meeting as long as (1) the changes and the parent’s and public agency’s agreement to the changes are in writing, and (2) every member of the IEP Committee is informed of the changes. <i>NOTE: Changes to the IEP made without a meeting may not involve a redrafting of the entire IEP and may not be substituted for holding an annual meeting.</i>	☐ NO The parent was not notified of changes to the IEP and procedures were not followed to amend the IEP.	☐ NOT APPLICABLE The IEP has not been amended without a full IEP committee meeting.

Group Discussion Questions:

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

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

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

[illegible]

COMPONENT D: LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT

Understanding Least Restrictive Environment (LRE):

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

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

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

Instructions for the LRE Review:

The review for LRE should follow the steps below:

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

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (LRE)

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Does the IEP include relevant accommodations that enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum?	• Policies and procedures • IEP • Evaluation results • Accommodations • Statements of specifically designed instruction • List of accommodations provided to teacher(s) • Classroom observation notes
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The IEP identifies accommodations to be provided to the student.	☐ NO Accommodations were included in the IEP, but there is no evidence of implementation.
☐ NOT APPLICABLE The IEP committee determined the child does not require accommodations.	

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

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

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

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

Group Discussion Questions:

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

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

[illegible]

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

Understanding the Secondary Transition (TRAN):

Secondary Transition components include “appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment; transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Committee meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Committee meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.” (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

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

Instructions for the Review:

The Secondary Transition review process includes the steps below:

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

COMPONENT E – SECONDARY TRANSITION (TRAN)

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?	• Current Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if applicable) goals • Prior year Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if applicable) goals
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES There is evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) for Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if appropriate) were addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP. OR If this is the student's first IEP that addresses secondary transition services because the student turned 14, this is considered an update, so the response would be YES.	☐ NO There is no evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) were addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP.

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

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

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-4 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320

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

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

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-5 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(b)(2)

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

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-6 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.320(b)(1)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that are related to the student's transition services needs?	• Annual IEP goals • Transition goal(s) from Transition section
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES There is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that is/are related to the student's transition services needs.	☐ NO Annual goal(s) do not address the student's transition services needs.

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-7 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.321(b)

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

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

RECORD REVIEW ITEM: TRAN-8 REGULATION 34 CFR §300.321(b)

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION	
Is there evidence that a representative of an applicable participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP committee meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority, if appropriate?	- PWN - Age of Majority letter (if applicable) - Notice of Committee Meeting to agency representative	
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION		
☐ YES There is appropriate documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student. OR There is documentation that representatives of agencies were invited, but parent did not give consent for agency representatives to attend the meeting.	☐ NO There is no documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student.	☐ NA IEP Committee determined that linkage to an outside agency and participation is not applicable.

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

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

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

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

[illegible]

COMPONENT F: EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION

Understanding the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE):

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

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

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

Instructions for the Review:

The ECSE review process includes the steps below:

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

COMPONENT F – EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION (ECSE)

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the ECSE IEP Committee include the parent and the appropriate personnel that will be providing services to the student?	• PWN listing IEP participants • IEP signature page
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The parent and appropriate personnel providing services were present at the IEP committee meeting.	☐ NO The parent and/or appropriate personnel providing services were not present at the IEP team meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

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

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

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

[illegible]

COMPONENT G: DISCIPLINE

Understanding the Discipline (DIS):

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions for the Review:

The Discipline review process includes the steps below:

1. Identify a team member who is knowledgeable about discipline procedures for students with disabilities.
2. Complete the Discipline review for each student file for a student who was suspended or expelled for 10 or more days.
3. Record the responses on the Discipline score sheet.
4. Transfer results to the Results Summary form.
5. If the LEA was found noncompliant, develop a plan for correction which includes timelines for implementation.
6. Collect and organize supporting documentation to be uploaded into SharePoint.

COMPONENT G – DISCIPLINE (DIS)

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the LEA notify the parents of a removal that constituted a change of placement (10 school days) due to a violation of a code of conduct by the student on the date on which the decision was made and did the LEA provide the parents with a copy of the procedural safeguards?	• IEP • Notice of Committee Meeting • PWN
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES There is documentation the parent was notified on the same date of the removal and was provided with a notice of procedural safeguards.	☐ NO There is no documentation the parent was notified on the same date of removal and was not provided a copy of the procedural safeguards notice (if the parent was notified on same date but did not receive procedural safeguards, this is still noncompliant).

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
Did the LEA conduct a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) after determination by the LEA, the parent, and relevant team members that the conduct was a manifestation of the student's disability? (Unless the LEA conducted the FBA before the behavior that resulted in the change of placement.)	FBA
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES* ☐ An FBA was conducted, if required. ☐ An FBA is included in the student's file. *All of the above must be present to mark YES.	☐ NO* ☐ No evidence of an FBA is available in the student's file. ☐ An FBA was conducted, but it does not meet the requirements. *Either of the above may indicate noncompliance.

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

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

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

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

RECORD REVIEW QUESTION	POTENTIAL SOURCE OF DOCUMENTATION
After the removal, was the student able to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the student's IEP?	• IEP • Progress reports • Service logs • Work samples • Teacher notes • Observations and interviews
EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	
☐ YES The student file demonstrates evidence that during the time of the removal, the student: • had access to the general education curriculum; and • continued to progress toward meeting goals.	☐ NO The student file did not reveal evidence of continued participation in the general education curriculum and progress toward IEP goals after the removal.

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

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

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

Group Discussion Questions:

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

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

INFORMATION	
LEA Name:	Required Sample Size:

Total number of student files reviewed is indicated below.

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

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

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

[illegible]

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY SELF-MONITORING RESULTS SUMMARY FORM

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

FAPE and CF

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

FAPE, CF, IEP, LRE, TRAN, ECSE, and DIS

Indicate the total number of files reviewed for each standard for IEP, LRE, TRAN, ECSE, and DIS. Enter the number of “Yes” files, the number of “No” files, the number of “NA” files, and enter the percent “Yes.” For any “No” response, a plan of improvement is recommended, including the following components: action steps for improvement, personnel responsible, timeline, and expected outcomes.

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

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

COMPONENT A – FAPE Student Files							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
FAPE-2							§300.308

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

COMPONENT B – CF Student Files							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
CF-1							§300.111(a)(c)
CF-2							§300.301
CFR-1							§300.303(1)(2)

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

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

COMPONENT E – SECONDARY TRANSITION							
Date Completed:							
Student File Reviews	Total Records Reviewed	Number Yes	Number No	Number NA	Percent Compliant	Plan of Improvement	Regulation
TRAN-1							§300.320
TRAN-2							§300.320
TRAN-3							§300.320
TRAN-4							§300.320
TRAN-5							§300.320
TRAN-6							§300.320
TRAN-7							§300.321
TRAN-8							§300.321

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

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

SharePoint Special Education Navigator Guidance

The steps below will provide guidance for uploading the required and supporting monitoring documentation. Upload all documentation used during the LEAs self-assessment process. MDE, OSE will use the uploaded documentation for the compliance verification process.

Step 1: Sign into SharePoint Special Education Navigator and access the LEAs folder. Follow the instructions below to access the location to upload all documentation for the monitoring cycle.

>LEA Folder

>Compliance Monitoring folder

>Integrated Monitoring Systems folder

>FY26 Cyclical Monitoring folder

>FY26 Active Cyclical Monitoring folder

>Policies & Procedures – Upload the School Board approved Special Education Policies for FAPE & Child Find **and** Special Education Procedures (FAPE-1, FAPE-3, FAPE-4, CF-1, CF-2) *Policies and procedures will be examined for evidence of FAPE, including comparable instruction as non-disabled peers, shortened school day, alternative school placement, and graduation requirements and Child Find requirements. Include any forms not included in the procedures related to Child Find activities such as requests for evaluation. Include evidence of implementation of FAPE such as school bell schedules, bus schedules and attendance/discipline reports for FAPE-3.*

>Student Files – Upload student files by student using the assigned student number, student initials, and MSIS number. Example: Bobbie Tobbie, MSIS #987987987 is first on the list. Her file will be saved as #1 B.T. 987987987.

All student files should contain the current IEP (25/26 school year) and the prior IEP (24/25), if eligible during that school year. IEPs should be organized in this order: IEP, NOM, PWN and other applicable documentation as listed below. Include any revision documentation, IEP agendas and meeting notes if relevant. Please be sure all documents are facing in the same direction when scanning for uploading into SharePoint.

Student files should contain the following additional information based on which review was conducted:

- FAPE-2 – Class schedule for prior and current school years
- CF-1, -2, CFR-1 - Referral documentation, MET forms, Parent requests and consent, Eligibility Determination Form, etc.
- TRAN – Transition assessments, Report Cards, student transcript
- ECSE – IFSP, IEP, Transition meeting documents
- DISC – MDR, FBA, BIP, school attendance record, Discipline history
- IEP – Students involved in a Formal State Complaint or Due Process should include a copy of the complaint and resolution.

>**Self-Assessment** – Upload the Self-Assessment Packet (cover page; team documentation; instructions, record review items, and score sheets for all seven components; and the summary form)

>**Student List** – The Student List will be already uploaded in your compliance monitoring folder by the OSE

APPENDIX E:
PROGRAMMATIC CYCLICAL
MONITORING PROTOCOL

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Monitor's Name:		Date of Review:	
District:		School:	
Student's Name, MSIS #, and Student Monitoring File #:		Date of Birth:	Age:
		Grade:	
Eligibility Category:	Secondary Eligibility:		Eligibility Date:
Component Category: ☐ IEP ☐ LRE	☐ FAPE ☐ CF		☐ Transition ☐ Discipline ☐ ECSE
☐ On-Site Visit: Verification of services observed (document whether the services observed are in alignment with the requirements of the student's IEP (i.e., inclusion, tutorial, or self-contained services, non-academic settings, P.E., accommodations, etc.)):			
Notes:			

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

REQUIRED: DOCUMENT NOTES BELOW FOR ALL COMPLIANT AND NONCOMPLIANT FINDINGS

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
FAPE-1 300.101(1)(b) Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the provisions of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities?	Board Approved Policies Procedures Manual	Language in the general policies or special education policies and procedures that discusses the development and implementation of special education services and or related services	YES	The public agency has documented policies approved by the school board and procedures to guide implementation. Policies and procedures should ensure FAPE must be available to all children with disabilities residing in Mississippi between the ages of three (3) and twenty (20).	
			NO	Policies and/or procedures are nonexistent, insufficient, or inconsistent with SBP 74.19/IDEA.	
FAPE-2 300.108 Does the public agency have physical education (PE) available to all students with disabilities?	Random samples of class schedules for students in self-contained placements Files/IEPs for students not receiving PE	Physical education for grade equivalent non-disabled peers Physical education on schedules of self-contained students	YES	All students with disabilities receive PE, as provided for their nondisabled peers, including specially designed instruction if needed as described in the IEP. If students are not receiving PE, there is a documented medical reason or PE is not provided for non-disabled peers.	
		Physical education deficits in the PLAAFP and services pages of IEP if specially designed instruction is needed in the area	NO	There are students who do not receive PE and have no documentation of a medical reason in the student's file.	
FAPE-3 300.101 Does the public agency have	School Master Schedule IEPs	buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers	YES	Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers or have justification of the shortened school day in their IEPs.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the following provisions of a FAPE for students with disabilities? A. Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers (i.e. buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers). B. Students with a shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement on the IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents/guardians.	LRE section Transportation section PLAAFP section School Bell Schedule Interviews Bus Schedules	Students on a shortened school day have justification in the PLAAFP, services, and LRE sections of their IEPs Documentation that the entire IEP Committee participated in the decision of the shortened school day	NO	Transportation/ school schedules indicate arrival and departure times that are not comparable to non-disabled students with no justifications in their IEPs.	
C. Students in alternate school placement or suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.	Attendance Report Discipline Report Interviews IEPs	Discipline deficits documented in the PLAAFP, Special Considerations, Services, and LRE sections if in alternative placement longer than 10 days Documentation of an IEP meeting to address behavior, placement, and continuation of services Documentation of the implementation of services Notice and participation	YES NO	Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services. Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days do not receive special education and/or related services.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

		of parents Data reviewed for placement and service decisions			
FAPE-4 300.101 and 300.102 Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the graduation requirements?	Board approved policies	Standard High School Diploma requirements Continued FAPE option for Alternate Diploma students through 20	YES	The public agency has documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.	
			NO	The public agency does not have documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.	
Child Find Initial & Eligibility (CF)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
CF-1 300.111(a)-(c) Does the public agency have Child Find policies and procedures in effect for all students, including students who are: A. Homeless, B. Wards of the state, C. In private schools at parental expense, D. Advancing from grade to grade, and E. Highly mobile and/or migrant?	Child Find policies Child Find procedures Any forms used for implementing Child Find procedures Posters/brochures	Evidence of Child Find activities for public schools Evidence of Child Find activities with nonpublic schools Documentation of referrals • Indicator 11 Data – Evaluation timelines Specific language that addresses all 5 areas of the Record Review Items in the CF-1 Standard	YES	Child Find policies and procedures are written and available. Procedures provide sufficient guidance on how to implement Child Find activities. Child Find procedures address all of the following: homeless children, private school children, general population of students, and migrant children.	
			NO	Child Find policies are unavailable. Child Find procedures are unavailable. Child Find policies and/or procedures are inconsistent with the criteria indicated in IDEA/SBP 74.19.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

CF-2 300.301 Does the public agency have a process in place for receiving and documenting verbal and written requests for evaluations from parents and others? Is there evidence that the public agency consistently follows the process?	Evaluation reports Referral documentation Intervention data/logs Parental requests and consent Parental complaints Indicator 11 – Evaluation timelines	Documentation of written and verbal requests Timelines PWNs provided as required Procedural Safeguards provided as required Documentation of MET meetings as required	YES	Child Find procedures are followed consistently when receiving and documenting written and verbal requests for a comprehensive evaluation from parents. A written process is established for implementing Child Find activities and there is evidence of implementation. Policies and procedures address handling Child Find at times when school is not in session; procedures are not limited by a total number per year.	
			NO	Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are nonexistent, insufficient, or inconsistent with IDEA. Child Find procedures for documenting written or verbal requests for evaluations are not followed, resulting in a failure to document requests received and/or respond to requests in a timely manner.	

Child Find Reevaluation (CFR)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
CFR-1 300.303(1)(2) Does the public agency ensure that reevaluations are provided for each IDEA eligible student within the required three-year period?	IEPs Eligibility Determination Forms PWNs Notices to Parents	Reevaluation dates on IEPs and Eligibility Reports Timelines Notice to Parents PWNs provided as	YES	The record shows that a reevaluation was conducted at least once every three (3) years.	
			NO	The record shows that a reevaluation was not conducted within a three (3) year period.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

		required Procedural Safeguards provided as required Data used for decisions IEP Committee Meeting to discuss reevaluation			
Individualized Education Program (IEP)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
IEP-1 300.322(a) Was the parent afforded the opportunity to participate in the IEP meeting?	Parent contact logs Notice of Committee Meeting PWN IEP committee participant signature page Other forms of documentation Interviews	Participant documentation on the IEP Parent invited with a Notice PWN provided as required Procedural Safeguards provided as required Parent concerns in the IEP PLAAFP	YES NO	Prior written notice was available. The parent participated or there is evidence that the parent was invited to participate in the IEP meeting. There is no prior written notice available and/or no evidence of an invitation for the parent to participate in the IEP meeting.	
IEP-2 300.320(a)(1)(i) Does the IEP contain present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in	IEP Strengths, Interest, Preference section of the PLAAFP Impact of Disability and Needs section of the PLAAFP	See Evidence column for Yes compliance	YES	Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance include the following information: Current performance in reading and math Academic and functional strengths Social, behavioral, and emotional skills	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

the general education curriculum?	Concerns of the Parent section of the PLAAFP			Interests and preferences Transition postsecondary goals, strengths, and impact (if applicable) Developmental strengths and impacts (if applicable) Results of the most recent evaluation Impact statement on how the disability affects the student's progress in the general education curriculum Academic and functional needs Gap/baseline data and relative skills provided for developing measurable annual goals Data sources Concerns of the parent for enhancing the student's education	
IEP-3 300.320(a)(2)(I)(A) Does the IEP include annual measurable goals that address the student's academic area of need? A measurable annual goal must contain the	IEP PLAAFP section Measurable Annual Goal pages	See Evidence column for Yes compliance	YES	The IEP includes measurable annual goals that: addresses the academic and functional needs in the PLAAFP includes the baseline data outlined in the PLAAFP for each area of need includes the specific action the student will perform	
			NO	Present levels of academic achievement and/or functional performance are not included in the IEP or does not include the required contents of the Evidence column for Yes compliance	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

following: - Clearly defined behavior: the specific action the student will be expected to perform. - The condition (situation, setting, or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed. - Performance Criteria describes the skill and performance level achieved in the IEP year.				includes the condition in which the behavior is to be performed includes the criteria and timeline for which the goal will be mastered	
			NO	Measurable annual goals are not included in the IEP or does not include the required contents of the Evidence column for Yes compliance.	
IEP-4 300.320(a)(4)-(7) Does the IEP indicate the amount, duration, and location where specially designed instruction and other IEP services will occur?	IEP Special Education and Related Services page	Specially Designed Instruction Related Services Support for Personnel General Education or Special Education location for services Actual beginning and ending dates Actual timeframe for duration of services (not “as needed”)	YES NO	The IEP specifically identifies amount, duration, and location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services. The IEP does not specify the amount, duration, and/or location of specially designed instruction and other IEP services.	
IEP-5 300.320(a)(4)(I) Does the IEP identify related	IEP PLAAFP section Special	Aligned to the needs in the PLAAFP Aligned with Special Considerations	YES	The IEP specifically identifies related services that align with the needs of the student and support achievement of annual goals.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

services that address the needs of the student and support annual goals?	Considerations	Aligned with related Measurable Annual Goals	NO	The IEP does not specify related services that align with the needs of the student or support annual goals. There is no evidence to support the delivery of related services.	
	Measurable Annual Goal pages Special Education and Related Services page		N/A	The IEP committee determined the child does not require related services.	
IEP-6 300.320(a)(6)(ii)(A)-(B) Does the IEP indicate student participation in the annual statewide assessment?	IEP	SCD Determination	YES	The IEP indicates that the student will participate in a statewide assessment. If the student is participating in an alternate assessment, the IEP indicates the reason. The IEP includes accommodations and/or modifications for assessment participation.	
		Statewide Assessment Determination Alternate Assessment if SCD PLAAFP alignment Grade-level General Education Assessments Assessment Accommodations aligned to PLAAFP and Instructional Accommodations	NO	The IEP does not address the student's participation in a statewide assessment and/or the IEP does not include justification as to why an alternate assessment, if appropriate.	
IEP-7 300.324(b)(1)(i) Has the IEP been reviewed at least annually? Has the IEP been revised or amended to address new and relevant information?	IEP	IEP annual dates	YES	With the exception of an initial IEP, the IEP has been updated within twelve months from the prior year IEP date, includes relevant information to demonstrate the student's present levels of performance, and address the current needs of the student.	
	Notice of Committee Meeting PWNs Amendment agreement forms Parent Requests Measurable Annual Goal pages	Annual checked in the IEP Committee Participants section of the 1 st page Revision or Amendment checked in the IEP Committee Participants section of the 2 nd page Parent Concerns addressed	NO	The IEP is dated outside of the one-year timeline and/or no evidence exists to indicate meaningful revisions were made to the IEP.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

	Grades	PLAAFP aligned to current grade level skills/needs			
	Discipline Reports				
	Attendance Report	Revision page			
		Progress with General Education classes and IEP Goals			
		Discipline concerns addressed			
		Other concerns/needs addressed (i.e., attendance, etc.)			
IEP-8 300.320(a)(3)(i)-(ii) Does the IEP contain descriptions of how the student's progress toward annual goals will be measured, including how often parents will be informed of the student's progress?	IEP	Annual Goals	YES	The IEP indicates how the student's progress will be measured and how often it will be reported to the parent. The record indicates that parents receive progress reports as included in the student's IEP. (includes the method of measurement and the current level of performance for report of progress.)	
	Measurable Annual Goal pages	Reports of progress includes behavior, condition, criteria, and timeline			
	Interviews	Documentation of progress being provided to parents	NO	The IEP does not indicate how often progress will be reported to parents or failed to include methods of measurement and current levels of performance.	
IEP-9 300.106(A) Did the IEP committee	IEP	Parent being invited	YES	There is documentation of an ESYS determination in the IEP folder.	
	ESY section	PWN to propose or refuse a service			
	ESY forms				

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

appropriately consider the need for Extended School Year Services (ESYS)?	PWN Notice of Committee Meeting	IEP ESY page completed All ESY criteria considered with ESY forms ESY Fact sheet provided to the parent ESY checked in the IEP Committee Participants section of the 2 nd page ESY services detailed if eligible with the type of service, location duration, frequency, dates, goals, etc.	NO	There is no documentation of an ESYS determination in the IEP folder.	
IEP-10 300.324(a)(4)(6) If the IEP was amended, did the LEA follow the procedures and notice requirements for making changes to the IEP?	IEP Amendment agreement form	Amendment checked in the IEP Committee Participants section of the 2 nd page Parent and LEA agreed to the amendment Not a change in any service or decision that could impact FAPE that would require the entire IEP Committee	YES NO N/A	Corrections or minor changes to the IEP between annual meetings. The IEP Committee agree to amend the IEP without a meeting as long as (1) the changes and the parent's and public agency's agreement to the changes are in writing, and (2) every member of the IEP Committee is informed of the changes. The parent was not notified of changes to the IEP and procedures were not followed to amend the IEP. The change include a decision that could impact FAPE that would require a revision by the entire IEP Committee. The IEP has not been amended without a full IEP committee meeting.	
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)					

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
LRE-1 300.116(b) Does the documentation demonstrate that the student's placement was: - determined annually, at a minimum, - based on the student's IEP, and - as close as possible to the student's home and resulted in the student being educated in the school that he or she would attend if nondisabled, unless the IEP requires another arrangement.	IEP	Placement matches PLAAFP, assessment, services	YES	Placement decisions are made in conformity with LRE provisions.	
	PLAAFP section	Placement considerations completed	NO	Placement decisions are not made in conformity with LRE provisions.	
	Placement Considerations section of the IEP	Placement decision			
	PWN	LRE Classification			
LRE-2 300.320(a)(6)(i) Does the IEP include relevant accommodations that enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum?	IEP	Accommodations in the PLAAFP aligned to areas of need	YES	The IEP identifies accommodations to be provided to the student and evidence of implementation was identified.	
	PLAAFP section	Accommodations documented in detail in the Special Education Section	NO	Accommodations were included in the IEP, but there is no evidence of implementation.	
	Special Education and Related Services page			No accommodations are included in the IEP.	
	PWN				
	Revision section				

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

LRE-3 300.324(a)(2) Does the IEP address special factors such as: • Language needs of the student • Communication needs of the student • Reading and writing media (braille, enlarged print, etc.), and • Assistive technology devices and services?	IEP PWN PLAAFP section Special Considerations section	Special factors considered or marked N/A Assistive Technology and communication decision documented as required Special Considerations match the details in the PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and Special Education and Related Services sections	YES	The IEP shows evidence of consideration of special factors as defined under 34 CFR §300.320(a)(2) with the required decisions for Assistive Technology and Communication documented.	
			NO	The IEP did not consider any special factors.	
LRE-4 300.320(a)(5) & 300.116(d) Does the IEP team consider all placement options and related services in conjunction with discussing any needed supplementary aids and services, accommodations/modifications, assistive technology and/or accessible materials, and supports for school personnel as well as potential harmful effects on the student? The IEP team also considered the potential	IEP PWN PLAAFP section Placement Considerations and LRE section	Impact of disability on general education participation in the PLAAFP Justifications for removals Consideration statement checked Special Considerations, Supplementary Aids and Services, Support for Personnel, Accommodations/ Modifications considered	YES	For a student not educated or served in the general education setting, the IEP includes justification for why the student's placement is not the general education classroom and: • Is based on the needs of the student; • Reflects that the committee has given adequate consideration to meeting the student's needs in the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services; and • If the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general education classes, even with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily, a justification is given for the decision.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

harmful effects of the child's placement and whether it would impede the child's ability to learn.			NO	Rationale is not given, or the rationale given: • Is not based on the student's needs; • Does not reflect consideration or the provision of supplementary aids and services in the general education classroom; and • Does not describe potential harmful effects to the student or others, if applicable.	
Transition (TRAN)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
TRAN-1 300.320 Are there appropriate measurable postsecondary goals addressing education or training, employment, and as needed, independent living?	IEP PLAAFP section Transition section	Education Goal Employment Goal Independent Living Goal Are goals aligned to the strengths, interests, and preferences from the PLAAFP? Measurable: Is it countable/able to be achieved? Is it an outcome and not a process? Is it future-based?	YES NO	The required postsecondary goals are present, measurable, and will occur after high school. Goals are not present, measurable, and/or do not state what the student will do after high school.	
TRAN-2 300.320 Is there evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) are	IEP PLAAFP section Transition section	Current Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if applicable) goals Prior year Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if	YES	There is evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) for Training, Education, Employment, & Independent Living (if appropriate) were addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP. OR	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

updated annually?		applicable) goals Were goals updated annually?		If this is the student's first IEP that addresses secondary transition services because the student turned 14, this is considered an update, so the response would be YES.	
			NO	There is no evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) were addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP.	
TRAN-3 300.320 Is there evidence that measurable postsecondary goals were based on an age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?	IEP PLAAFP section Transition Assessments Transition section	Transition assessments discussed in the PLAAFP Strengths, Interests, Preferences section Transition assessments/data sources documented in the Transition section	YES	The use of a transition assessment(s) for the development of postsecondary goals is evident in the IEP.	
			NO	There is no evidence of a transition assessment(s) OR transition assessments were not used to develop postsecondary goals.	
TRAN-4 300.320 Are there transition services/activities in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goals?	IEP PLAAFP section Measurable Annual Goal pages Special Education and Related Services section Transition section	Impact of disability/deficits on transition goals in the PLAAFP Academic and Functional Annual Goals alignment to Transition Goals Other Annual Goals related to transition goals Progress on related IEP goals to transition Special education, related services, accommodations,	YES	There is at least one transition service/activity documented in the IEP associated with meeting each of the postsecondary goals.	
			NO	There are no transition services/activities documented in the IEP associated with meeting each of the postsecondary goals.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

		modifications, support for personnel related to transition goals			
TRAN-5 300.320(b)(2) Do transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goals?	IEP	Classes related to transition goals	YES	Transition services include a course of study that aligns with the student's postsecondary goals.	
	Class schedule Student Transcript Report Card	Participation and progress in classes related to transition goals Implementation of collaboration with agencies related to transition goals	NO	Transition services do not include a course of study that aligns with the student's postsecondary goals.	
TRAN-6 300.320(b)(1) Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that are related to the student's transition services needs?	IEP	Annual IEP goals	YES	There is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that is/are related to the student's transition services needs.	
	PLAAFP section Goal pages Transition section	Transition goal(s) from Transition section Identify services needs and determine if the annual goal(s) are related to the services needs.	NO	Annual goal(s) do not address the student's transition services needs.	
TRAN-7 300.321(b) Did the student with a disability participate in the IEP committee meeting with the purpose of providing input and/or considerations for the development of postsecondary goals?	IEP Documentation of participants from the 1 st page Documentation of participants from the 2 nd page Notice of	Documentation of the student being invited Documentation of the student participation Documentation of the student's or parent's refusal, if applicable	YES	There is documentation that the student participated in the IEP committee meeting and provided input and/or considerations toward the development of his/her postsecondary goals. OR There is documentation that the student was invited to participate in the IEP committee meeting with the purpose of providing input	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

	Committee Meeting			and/or considerations for the development of postsecondary goals.	
			NO	There is no documented evidence that the student was invited to or participated in the IEP committee meeting or provided input and/or considerations toward the development of his/her postsecondary goals.	
TRAN-8 300.321(b) Is there evidence that a representative of an applicable participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP committee meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached age of majority, if appropriate?	IEP Notice of Committee Meeting Transition section PWN	Relevant participating agency documented on signature page Agency invited on the Notice of Committee Meeting Relevance of agency verified according to the Transition page	YES	There is appropriate documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student. OR There is documentation that representatives of agencies were invited, but parent did not give consent for agency representatives to attend the meeting.	
			NO	There is no documentation (e.g., Notice of Committee Meeting) indicating that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student.	
Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
ECSE-1 300.321(a)	PWN Notice of	Documentation of participants on the IEP, invitation, and PWN	YES	The parent and appropriate personnel providing services were present at the IEP committee meeting.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Did the ECSE IEP Committee include the parent and the appropriate personnel that will be providing services to the student?	Committee Meeting IEP Committee Participants section of the 1 st page Interviews		NO	The parent and/or appropriate personnel providing services were not present at the IEP team meeting.	
ECSE-2 300.124 (c) Did an LEA representative participate in the transition conference arranged with the early intervention program for a preschooler who was transitioning from an early intervention program?	PWN Notice of Committee Meeting IEP Committee Participants section of the 1 st page Interviews	Documentation of participants on the IEP, invitation, and PWN	YES	An LEA representative attended the transition conference to develop an IEP.	
			NO	An LEA representative did not attend the transition conference to develop an IEP.	
ECSE-3 300.124 & 300.101(b) For preschoolers transitioning from an early intervention program (Part C), was the IEP developed and implemented by the child's 3 rd birthday?	PWN IEP Documentation of transition conference Notes Progress on Annual Goal pages Implementation documentation	Dates for birthday, age, and IEP development Documentation of services being provided as required by the IEP	YES	The IEP was developed and implemented by the child's third birthday.	
			NO	The IEP was not developed and implemented by the child's third birthday.	
ECSE-4 300.323(b)	Copy of IFSP Copy of IEP	Data and information from the IFSP being considered by the	YES	There is evidence the IFSP was considered in developing the IEP.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

For preschoolers transitioning from Part C, was the Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) considered in developing the IEP?	Teacher anecdotal notes Agency representative anecdotal notes Other teacher/agency documentation on student progress	committee for IEP development Progress on ISFP goals and services being considered when determining strengths, improvement, developmental skills, and needs for the IEP	NO	There was no evidence the IFSP was considered in developing the IEP.	
Discipline (DIS)					
Record Review Item	Potential Source of Documentation	Look-Fors	Compliant	Evidence	Notes
DIS-1 300.530(h) Did the LEA notify the parents of a removal that constituted a change of placement (10 school days) due to a violation of a code of conduct by the student on the date on which the decision was made, and did the LEA provide the parents with a copy of the procedural safeguards?	IEP IEP Committee Participants section Procedural Safeguards Notice section Summary of Revisions section Notice of Committee Meeting PWN	Parent being invited to the meeting Parent and entire IEP committee participation Documentation of parent receiving Procedural Safeguards as required Documentation of the data used for the decision	YES NO	There is documentation the parent was notified on the same date of the removal and was provided with a notice of procedural safeguards. There is no documentation the parent was notified on the same date of removal and was not provided a copy of the procedural safeguards notice (if the parent was notified on same date but did not receive procedural safeguards, this is still noncompliant).	
DIS-2 300.530(e)	IEP	Documentation of out-of-school suspensions and/or expulsions	YES	The date of the MDR is not more than ten (10) school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of a student with a	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Was the Manifestation Determination Review (MDR) conducted within 10 school days of the district's decision to change the placement of a student with a disability for disciplinary reasons?	Student Discipline Records MDR Other discipline-related data/documentation	Dates for removal/change in placement and MDR Change in placement decision	NO	disability through a school suspension or expulsion. The date of the MDR is more than ten (10) school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of the student with a disability through a suspension or expulsion. Special Circumstances: School personnel may remove a student to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than forty-five (45) school days without regard to whether the behavior is determined to be a manifestation of the student's disability for possession of a weapon, use of illegal drugs, or infliction of serious bodily injury.	
DIS-3 300.530(f) Did the district conduct a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) after determination by the district, the parent, and relevant team members that the conduct was a manifestation of the student's disability?			YES NO	An FBA was conducted, if required and included in the student's file. No evidence of an FBA is available in the student's file OR An FBA was conducted, but it does not meet the requirements.	
DIS-4 300.530(f)(1)(i)	IEP Notice of Committee Meeting	BIP discussed and developed by the IEP Committee	YES	BIP is included in the student's file, addresses relevant behaviors, and was modified to address student behavior(s).	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Did the district develop a Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) for the student as a result of the FBA?	PWN IEP Revision page PLAAFP Special Considerations page Special Education and Related Services page BIP	Details about the BIP included in the appropriate areas of the IEP: deficits, behavior needs, behavior services to implement the BIP	NO	A BIP is not included in the student's file. OR A BIP is included, but it does not address current behavior. OR A BIP was not modified to address the student's behavior(s).	
DIS-5 300.530(d)(4) & (5) After the removal, was the student able to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the student's IEP?	IEP	Documentation of receiving general education instruction	YES	The student file demonstrates evidence that during the time of the removal, the student had access to the general education curriculum and continued to progress toward meeting goals.	
	Annual Goal pages Attendance Report Progress Reports Grades Service Logs Work Samples Teacher Notes Observations and Interviews	Documentation of making progress in general education classes Documentation of making progress on IEP goals Documentation of IEP revisions to any lack of progress	NO	The student file did not reveal evidence of continued participation in the general education curriculum and progress toward IEP goals after the removal.	
DIS-6 300.350(b)(2) & §300.350(d)(1)(i)	Copy of MDR form IEP	Dates of removal and continuation of services Documentation of service implementation	YES	The student continued to receive special education and related services beginning on the 11th day of suspension/removal in their regular school setting, home-school setting, or alternative school site.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

Did the student receive special education and related services beginning on the 11 th day of suspension that allowed him/her to continue to access and make progress in the general education curriculum?	IEP Special Education and Related Services page				
	School attendance record Disciplinary action documentation		NO	The student did not receive special education and related services beginning on the 11th day of suspension/removal (student did not receive any educational services beginning on the 11th day of suspension).	

Additional Notes

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION CYCLICAL MONITORING DATA REVIEW FORM**

APPENDIX F:
PROGRAMMATIC INTENSIVE
MONITORING PROTOCOL

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

Team Leader:	District:
Date of Review:	
NOTES:	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19**

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
CF-A	300.111(a) 300.111(c) 300.131(a)	Does the public agency have Child Find (CF) policies and procedures in effect, including those addressing special populations, and specifically state requests for an evaluation may not be limited by the number per year or time of year a request is received? Special population include: • Homeless children • Wards of the State • Private School children • Children advancing from grade to grade, and • Highly mobile and/or migrant children.	YES	CF Policies CF policies are consistent with IDEA and SBP 72.14 CF procedures provide sufficient guidance to implement CF policies CF procedures are in effect to address each of the special populations CF procedures are not limited by the number of requests or evaluations per year.	Board approved policies Policy manual procedures Interviews
			NO	The public agency does not have Child Find (CF) policies and procedures in effect, or policies and procedures do not sufficiently address the following special population: • Homeless children • Wards of the State • Private School children • Children advancing from grade to grade, and • Highly mobile and/or migrant children.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19**

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

				CF procedures are limited by the number of requests or evaluations per year.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19

ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
FAPE- A	300.101 Miss. Admin Code 7-3: 74.19(1)(b)	Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that address the provisions of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities?	YES	The public agency has documented policies approved by the school board and procedures to guide implementation.	Board Approved Policies Procedures Manual
			NO	Policies and procedures are nonexistent, insufficient, or inconsistent with SBP 72.19/IDEA.	
FAPE-B	300.108	Does the public agency have physical education (PE) available to all students with disabilities?	YES	All students with disabilities receive PE. If students are not receiving PE, there is a documented medical reason.	Random samples of class schedules for students in self-contained placements. Files for students not receiving PE.
			NO	There are students who do not receive PE and have no documentation of a medical reason in the student's file.	

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
FAPE-C	300.101 Miss. Admin Code 7-3: 74.19	Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that addresses the following provisions of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities?			School Master Schedule IEP Discipline Report
		a) Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers (i.e. buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers)	YES	Students receive comparable instructional time as their non-disabled peers (i.e. buses arrive and pick-up at comparable times to non-disabled peers)	School Bell Schedule Interviews

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

			NO	Transportation schedules indicate arrival and departure times that are not comparable to non-disabled students.	
		b) Students on shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement on their IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents.	YES	Students on shortened school day have individual justifications for their placement on their IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents.	
			NO	Students on shortened school day do not have individual justifications for their placement on their IEPs and have been agreed upon by parents.	
			NA	No students reported on shortened school day.	
		c) Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.	YES	Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days receive special education and/or related services.	
			NO	Students in alternate school placement or who have been suspended for longer than 10 days do not receive special education and/or related services.	
			NA	There are no students in alternative school, and/or no students that have been suspended for 10 days or longer.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
FAPE-D	Miss Admin. Code 7-3: 36.1	Does the public agency have policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that addresses the graduation requirements?	YES	The public agency has documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.	Board approved polices
			NO	The public agency does not have documented policies approved by the local school board and procedures for graduation requirements.	
DIS-A	300.107(a)	Does the public agency have discipline policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that ensure compliance with IDEA and SBP 72.19 for discipline of students with disabilities?	YES	The public agency have discipline policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that ensure compliance with IDEA and SBP 72.19 for discipline of students with disabilities.	Board approved policies
			NO	The public agency does not have discipline policies that have been approved by the local school board and procedures in effect that ensure compliance with IDEA and SBP 72.19 for discipline of students with disabilities. Policies or procedures are non-existent, insufficient, or inconsistent with IDEA or SBP 72.19.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19**

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
LRE-A	300.115(a)(b)	Does the public agency have policies and procedures in effect to ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related and the continuum of alternative placement is not separate from non-disabled peers?	YES	The public agency has documented policies approved by the school board and procedures for determining the continuum of alternative placements including instruction in: • General Education • Special Classes • Special Schools • Child's Home • Hospitals or Institutions Make provisions for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with general education class placement.	IEP – Special Education and Related Services Section IEP-Description of Specifically Designed Services IEP-Special Considerations Section IEP-Placement Consideration and LRE Determinations Location of Special Education Classrooms
			NO	The public agency does not have policies and procedures for the continuum of alternative placements to meet the needs of children with disabilities. No provision for supplementary services to be provided in conjunction with general education placement.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19**

**ON-SITE MONITORING DOCUMENT REVIEW AND INTERVIEW FORM
POLICIES/PROCEDURES/DISTRICTWIDE IMPLEMENTATION**

--	--	--	--	--	--

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
LRE-B	300.107(a)	Does the public agency provide opportunity for students with disabilities to have equal opportunities to participate in non-academic and extracurricular services and activities with the use of supplementary aids and services?	YES	There is documentation that students with disabilities participate in non-academic and extracurricular activities with their non-disabled peers. (e.g. Students in self-contained classes eat in the cafeteria with their non-disabled peers.)	- Lists of self-contained classes/students - Interviews - On-site observations - Schedules
			NO	There is no documentation that students with disabilities do not participate in non-academic and extracurricular activities with their non-disabled peers. (e.g. Students in self-contained classes do not eat in the cafeteria with their non-disabled peers.) Special education classrooms are located in separate/isolated areas of the school.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY**

Monitor's Name		Date of Review:	
District:		School:	
Student's Name:	Date of Birth:	Age:	Grade:
Eligibility Category:	Secondary Eligibility:		Eligibility Date:
NOTES:			

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-1	300.300(a)(1)(i)	Did the public agency obtain informed consent from the parent of the child before conducting the evaluation?	YES	The file shows evidence of signed permission to conduct an evaluation.	MET meeting documentation form Eligibility Determination form
			NO	The file does not show evidence of signed permission to conduct an evaluation.	
CFI-2	300.304(a)	Did the public agency provide notice to the parents that describes any evaluation procedures the agency proposes to conduct?	YES	The files shows evidence of documents describing the evaluation process and areas of proposed assessment.	Evaluation Plan
			NO	The files does not show evidence of documents describing the evaluation process and areas of proposed assessment.	
CFI-3	300.304(c)(4)	Did the public agency assess the child in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities?	YES	All areas related to the suspected disability were assessed.	Evaluation Plan Evaluation Report Eligibility Determination form
			NO	All areas related to the suspected disability were not assessed.	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-4	300.304(b) 300.304(c)	Did the public agency conduct the evaluations: 1) Using a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental and academic information provided by the parent, that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability; 2) Not use any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program; 3) Use technically sound instruments that may assess cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors; 4) Are not discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis; 5) Provided and administered in the child's native language or other mode of communication; 6) Administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel in accordance	YES	The public agency conducted the evaluations in accordance with CFR 300.304.	Eligibility Determination Form
			NO	The public agency failed to address one or more components for the evaluations in accordance with CFR 300.304.	Evaluation reports Eligibility Criteria Form

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY**

		with any instructions provided by the producer of the assessment?			
--	--	---	--	--	--

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-5	300.301(c)(1) 300.301(d) 300.301(e) 300.309(c) 300.311(b)(7)	Did the public agency conduct the initial evaluation within 60 calendar days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation? Exemptions to the timeframe are: A parent <u>repeatedly</u> fails or refuses to make a child available for the evaluation; A child enrolls in a school of another public agency after an evaluation has begun, but prior to determining eligibility; or The public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed. The public agency is conducting an evaluation using a Response to Intervention (RtI) process and the data do not indicate the presence or absence of a disability after 60 calendar days and the parent and public agency agree in writing to extend the timeframe.	YES	Evaluations and reports are completed within 60 calendar days of the day the parent gives written consent for an initial evaluation on the consent forms except in the following situations: *Parents repeatedly fail or refuse to make their child available *Child transfers to a school in another agency after evaluations have begun, but before determinations of eligibility have been made *Evaluations are conducted using RtI data and parents and public agency agree in writing to extend the timeframes.	Signed parental consent forms Evaluation report(s) with dates report(s) were completed
			NO	All assessments were not completed within 60 calendar days of the day the parent gave written consent. [No exemptions apply.] All assessments were completed, but the evaluation report(s) was not completed within 60 calendar days of the day the parent gave written consent. [No exemptions apply.]	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-6	300.8 300.301 300.304 300.305(a)(1)(2)	Did the public agency proceed with a referral for a comprehensive evaluation for a child with a suspected disability without delaying referral because the child has not participated in an RtI process?	YES	The record shows that MET did not require the child to participate in the RtI process when the child was suspected of having a disability under 34 CRF 300.8.	Teacher Support Team Documentation Referral form
			NO	The record shows contains information indicating that the LEA required the child to participate in the RtI process when the child was suspected of having a disability.	MET meeting documentation forms Data from interventions (Progress monitoring screening data, etc. Evaluation report(s) Referral form
			NA	MET did not suspect the child of having an obvious disability.	Eligibility Determination Report
CFI-7	300-307 300.311(7)	Did the public agency proceed with a referral for a comprehensive evaluation for a child suspected of having a specific learning disability without delaying the referral because the child has not participated in an RtI process?	YES	The record shows evidence of scientific research-based intervention data and provides a summary of the interventions that have been implemented prior to referral or during the evaluation process.	Teacher Support Team Documentation Referral form
			NO	The student record contains no evidence that interventions were provided to the child.	MET meeting documentation forms Data from interventions (Progress monitoring screening data, etc.)
			NA	Interventions are not warranted for this student. MET suspected this child of having an obvious disability.	Evaluation report(s) Referral form Eligibility Determination Report

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-8	SBP 300.301(b)	Did the public agency have a process for receiving and documenting verbal and written requests for a comprehensive evaluation from parent, public agency, teacher and/or Teacher Support Team?	YES	Child Find procedures are followed for receiving and documenting written and verbal requests for a comprehensive evaluation from (a) parents, (b) public agencies, and (c) TST committees.	Child Find procedures (procedures manual) MET referral forms MET meeting documentation forms
			NO	Child Find procedures for documenting a written or verbal request are non-existent, insufficient, or inconsistent with SBP 72.19. Child Find procedures for documenting a written or verbal request are not followed resulting in a failure to document requests received and/or responding to requests in a timely manner.	
CFI-9	SBP 300.301(b)(1) Special Education Eligibility Determination pp. 291-329	Did the public agency hold MET meetings with the participation of appropriate members within 14 calendar days of receiving request to determine the need for comprehensive evaluations?	YES	All of the appropriate members, including parents and others knowledgeable of the child, are invited to participate in the MET meetings using available methods. MET meetings occur within 14 calendar days of receiving requests for comprehensive evaluations.	Documentation of TST referrals with dates Documentation of MET referrals with dates Documentation of invitations to MET meetings Records of MET meetings with dates of

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

				A decision is made whether or not to proceed with a comprehensive evaluations.	the meetings and list of participants.
			NO	The public agency fails to invite the parent and/or other appropriate MET members (i.e. special education teacher, regular education teacher with knowledge of student, psychometrists, psychologist, speech pathologist, school nurse, etc.) to participant in the MET meeting. MET meeting did not occur within 14 calendar days of receiving requests for comprehensive evaluations.	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-10	SBP 300-301(b)(1)(i)(a) 300-301(b)(1)(ii)(a) 300-301(b)(1)(iii)(a)	Did the public agency provide written notice of the committee's decision to the parent within 7 days of the MET meeting?	YES	There is evidence that the parent was given written notice of the MET committee's decision within 7 days of the meeting.	Written Prior Notice for Initial Evaluation
			NO	There is no evidence that the parent was given written notice of the MET committee's decision within 7 days of the meeting.	Written Prior Notice for Refusal to Evaluate
CFI-11	SBP 300.306(a)(2)	Did the public agency provide parents all of the required documents 7 calendar days prior to the meeting to determine initial eligibility? (For children transitioning from Part C required documents provided at transition meeting.)	YES	Copies of all eligibility reports are given to the parent at least 7 calendar days prior to meeting. Paperwork is available to prove that the parent waived the right for notice of meeting 7 calendar days prior to the meeting and/or paperwork is available to prove that the parent waived the right to have a copy of the eligibility report 7 calendar days prior to the meeting.	Records of MET meetings with dates of the meetings Copies of Prior Written Notice provided to parents with dates provided Documentation of provision of Procedural Safeguards Notices with dates provided
			NO	The public agency did not provide parents all of the required documents, and/or did not meet the required 7 calendar days prior to the MET meeting unless there is documentation to show that the parent waived that right. The public agency provides parents the WPN on the same day of the MET meeting	Records of transition planning conferences from Part C to B. Record of IEP or IFSP in place by 3 rd birthday

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFI-12 <i>Preschool Initial Evaluation Only</i>	300.124 300.321(f)	For children transitioning from Part C, did the public agency utilize child information from the Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and other documentation provided by First Steps Early Intervention in suspecting or when determining eligibility for Part B supports and services?	YES	Information from Part C must be documented and <u>can</u> include: Observations in more than one setting and in multiple activities; Interviews (information provided by parents or caregiver); Results of evaluations.	First Steps Early Intervention Forms Records from the Transition Conference Evaluation Team Report Referral Form Prior Written Notice
			NO	There is no evidence the data indicated above is documented as part of the decision-making process for suspecting a disability or determining eligibility.	
			NA	The child is not transitioning from C to B.	
CFI-13	300.323(e)(2)(f)(1) (Transfer from out-of-state)	Did the public agency conduct an evaluation (if determined to be necessary) for a student that transferred from an out-of-state agency?	YES	There is evidence the public agency conducted an evaluation and/or reviewed prior evaluation data to determine the student is eligible for special education services.	Previous Eligibility Report from Out-of-State Eligibility Determination Form Evaluation reports
			NO	There is no evidence the public agency	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – INITIAL EVALUATIONS ONLY**

				conducted an evaluation and/or reviewed prior evaluation data to determine the student is eligible for special education services.	Signed parental consent forms
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY**

Monitor's Name:			Date of Review:		
District:			School:		
Student's Name:		Date of Birth:	Age:	Grade:	
Eligibility Category:	Secondary Eligibility:		Eligibility Date:		
NOTES:					

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFR-1	300.303(1)(2)	Did the public agency provide a reevaluation within the required 3-year period?	YES	The record shows that a reevaluation was conducted at least once every three (3) years.	Eligibility Determination Form
			NO	The record shows that a reevaluation was not conducted within a three (3) year period.	
CFR-2	300.304(a) 300.305(d)(1)(i)(ii)	Did the public agency provide notice to the parents of a child with a disability that describes any evaluation procedures the agency proposes to conduct?	YES	The record contains documentation that the public agency notified the child's parents of – 1. That determination and the reasons for the determination 2. The rights of the parents to request an assessment to determine whether the child continues to be a child with a disability, and to determine the child's educational needs	Notice for Reevaluation - No Additional Assessment Requested Notice for Reevaluation – Additional Assessment Requested Prior Written Notice
			NO	The record does not show that the parent was notified in writing about the IEP/MET committee's decision.	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFR-3	300.305(e)(1)	Did the public agency conduct a reevaluation before determining that the child no longer is a child with a disability and/or continues to need special education services?	YES	The record shows that the public agency conducted a reevaluation before determining that the child no longer a child with a disability and in need of special education services.	Child Find procedures (procedures manual)
			NO	There is no documentation to show that a reevaluation was conducted to determine the child is no longer a child with a disability. (i.e., the child no longer receives L/S services on the current IEP, but no documentation is available to prove the child has been dismissed from these services.)	MET referral forms MET meeting documentation forms Eligibility Determination form Prior Written Notice
			NA	The child has not had a change in services and continues to be a child with a disability.	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFR-4	300.305(a) 300.306(a)(1)	Did the public agency invite parents and others with knowledge of the child to participate in the IEP Committee meeting to review existing evaluation data to determine the need for comprehensive evaluation? MET/IEP Team members may participate by (1) Being present at the meeting; (2) Using an alternate technology (e.g., phone conference); or (3) Submitting written information or opinions.	YES	All of the appropriate members, including parents and others knowledgeable of the child, are invited to participate in the MET meetings using available methods. All appropriate members participate in the MET meetings using available methods.	Documentation of MET referrals with dates Documentation of invitations to MET meetings Records of MET meetings with dates of the meetings and list of participants
			NO	All of the appropriate members, including parents and others knowledgeable of the child, were not invited to participate in the MET meetings using available methods.	IEP Review/Revision section of members present Prior Written Notice

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
CFR-5	SBP 300.303(a) 300.304 300.305 300.306 Special Education Eligibility Determination Guidelines pp. 303-305	If the child was initially determined to be eligible with a ruling of Developmentally Delayed (DD), did the public agency conduct a reevaluation prior to the child's 10 th birthday?	YES	There is evidence that a comprehensive reevaluation was conducted prior to the child's 10 th birthday and a new eligibility other than Developmental Delay (DD) was in place by that date.	Eligibility Determination Report MSIS Screen IEP Review/Revision Dates
			NO	There is evident that a comprehensive reevaluation was not completed prior to the child's 10 th birthday and a new eligibility other than Developmental Delay (DD) was not in place by that date.	MET/IEP Documentation Date of Comprehensive Reevaluation Reports
			NA	The child's original eligibility was not Developmental Delay (DD) or the child has not reached his/her 10 th birthday.	

ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM

CHILD FIND – REEVALUATIONS ONLY

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Monitor's Name		Date of Review:	
District:		School:	
Student's Name:		Date of Birth:	Age:
Grade:			
Eligibility Category:	Secondary Eligibility:	Eligibility Date:	
NOTES:			

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-1	300.320(a) 300.323(a)	Did the public agency have an IEP in effect for the child?	YES	The public agency has an IEP in effect for the child.	Current IEP
			NO	The public agency did not have an IEP in effect for the child.	
DS-2	300.321(1)(1)(2) (3)(4)(i)(ii)(iii) (5)(6)(7)	Did the public agency ensure that the IEP Committee for the child include a) Parents; b) General Education Teacher; c) Special Education Teacher; d) Agency Representative e) Related Service Personnel as appropriate; f) Child as appropriate	YES	The IEP Committee includes all persons as stated in SBP 300.321 regulation.	IEP-Signature Page
			NO	The IEP Committee does not include required members as stated in SBP 300.321 regulation and/or no excusal form included in file.	
DS-3	300.321(b)(1)(i)(ii)	Did the public agency ensure the IEP Committee review/revise the IEP as appropriate to address a) Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals; b) The results of any reevaluation; c) Information about the child provided to or by the parents; d) The child's anticipated needs.	YES	Invitation to Committee Meeting Prior Written Notices Summary of review/revisions	IEP-Signature Page IEP-Goal Page
			YES	The IEP Committee did not review/revise the IEP as appropriate.	
			NA	No revision required during this audit	
DS-4	300.320(A)(1)(i)(ii)	Did the IEP include a statement of how the student's disability affects the child's involvement and progress in general education?	YES	Impact statement explains how the disability affects performance.	IEP-PLAAFP
			NO	No impact statement. OR Statement does not address all areas of involvement and progress in the general curriculum.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-5	300.324(a)(1)(i)-(iv)	Does the IEP include student's strengths?	YES	IEP includes the student's strengths.	IEP-PLAAFP IEP-SCD Determination Section
			NO	IEP does not include the student's strengths.	
		Does the IEP include concerns of the parents?	YES	IEP includes concerns of the parents.	
			NO	IEP does not include concerns of the parents.	
		Does the IEP include results of the most recent evaluation?	YES	IEP includes results of the most recent evaluation.	
			NO	IEP does not include results of the most recent evaluation.	
		Does the IEP include the student's academic needs?	YES	IEP includes the student's academic needs.	
			NO	IEP does not include the student's academic needs.	
			NA	No academic needs identified	
		Does the IEP include developmental and functional needs?	YES	IEP does include developmental and functional needs.	
			NO	IEP does not include developmental and functional needs.	
			NA	The student has no developmental and/or functional needs.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-6	300.324(a)(2)(i)-(v)	Does the IEP address if appropriate; a) A child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others; b) A child with limited English proficiency (consider the language needs of the child); c) A child who is blind or visually impaired; d) A child who is deaf or hard of hearing e) A child's needs of assistive technology devices and services	YES	There is alignment between the academic/behavioral/functional needs identified in the IEP and the annual goals or evidence in the IEP that the IEP Committee based on the severity of needs, decided to prioritize addressing the needs.	IEP-PLAAFP IEP-ANNUAL GOALS Special Consideration page
			NO		
			NA		

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-7	300.320(a)(2)(i) 300.324(b)(i)	Do annual goals address the child's academic area(s) of need?	YES	There is alignment between the academic needs identified in the IEP and the annual goals or evidence in the IEP that the IEP Committee, based on the severity of needs, decided to prioritize addressing the needs, (i.e. if student is in 9th grade reading on the 3rd grade level there should be a reading/decoding goal, not just identify the main idea, etc.) The PLAAFP summary identifies baseline functioning data. There must be a direct relationship between each measurable annual goal and the present levels of academic achievement and functional performance that precede it.	IEP-PLAAFP IEP-ANNUAL GOALS
			NO	Annual goals fail to address the child's academic needs identified in the IEP.	
			NA	Annual goals addressing the child's academic area(s) of need are not necessary at this time.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-8	300.320(A)(2)(i)	Do annual goals address the child's functional area(s) of need?	YES	There is alignment between the functional needs identified in the IEP and the annual goals. Functional means nonacademic, as in "routine activities of everyday living." There must be a direct relationship between each measurable annual goal and the present levels of academic achievement and functional performance that precede it.	ANNUAL GOALS
			NO	The annual goals fail to reasonably address functional area(s) of need identified in the IEP.	
			NA	Annual goals addressing the child's functional area(s) of need are not necessary at this time.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-9	300.320(a)(2)(i) 300.324(b)(1)	Are annual goals stated in measurable terms? (Performance criteria desired: the level the child must demonstrate for mastery and the number of times the child must demonstrate the skill or behavior.)	YES	Measurable annual goals are statements in measurable terms that describe what can be taught to the child using specially-designed instruction within a twelve-month period. A measurable annual goal must contain the following: - Clearly defined behavior: the specific action the child will be expected to perform. - The condition (situation, setting or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed.	IEP (Measurable Annual Goals)
			NO	The annual goals do not describe what can be taught to the child using specially-designed instruction, and do not include the above.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-10	300.320(a)(3)(i) 300.320(a)(3)(ii)	Does the IEP include a description of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals will be measured? (Method of Measure)	YES	The IEP includes a description of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals will be measured.	IEP-Current Level of Performance (CLP) for Report of Progress
			NO	The IEP does not includes a description of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals will be measured	
		Does the IEP include periodic reports on the progress the child is making toward meeting the annual goals?	YES	There is evidence to determine sufficient and/or insufficient progress was made.	If audit occurs prior to progress monitoring time, refer to previous year IEP.
			NO	The IEP does not include evidence or documentation of sufficient and/or insufficient progress reported appropriately or the areas are left blank.	
DS-11	300.324(a)(2) 300.324(b)(2)	Does the IEP address Special Consideration?	YES	The IEP specifically identifies the provision of Special Considerations that aligns with the needs of the child and supports achievement of annual goals.	IEP-Special Considerations Page
			NO	The IEP does not specifically identify the provision of Special Considerations that aligns with the needs of the child and supports achievement of annual goals.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-12	SBP 300.39(b)(3)	Does the IEP include a statement of specifically designed instruction that addresses the needs of the child and supports annual goals to enable the child- a) To advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals; b) To be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.	YES	SBP 74.19 300.39(b)(3) The IEP specifically identifies the provision of specifically-designed instruction and describes the nature of the instruction that aligns with the needs of the child and supports the achievement of annual goals. Examples: *Graph-phonetic strategies (visual/auditory) including letter/sound knowledge, phonemic awareness, de-coding * Explicit instruction on how to use a graphic organizer * Direct instruction and support for specialized software and equipment *Explicit instruction in the writing process including prewriting activities, writing, revising, editing, and publishing *Multi-sensory teaching strategies *Direct instruction in computation and reasoning strategies	<i>Specially designed instruction</i> means adapting, as appropriate to the needs of an eligible child, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction— (i) To address the unique needs of the child that result from the child's disability; and (ii) To ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that the child can meet the educational standards
			NO	The IEP does not identify specially designed instruction and supports the achievement of annual goals.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-13	300.320(a)(7)	Does the statement of specially-designed instruction indicate: a) Location b) Beginning/ending dates of services c) Duration/frequency of those services.	YES	The IEP specifically identifies the location, beginning/ending dates of services and duration/frequency of those services.	IEP-Description of Specially-Designed Instruction
			NO	The IEP does not specifically identify the location, beginning/ending dates of services and duration/frequency of those services.	
DS-14	300.320(a)(4)	Does the IEP identify modifications to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum?	YES	Modifications mean changes made to the content that students are expected to learn where amount or complexity of materials is altered from grade level curriculum expectations. When an instructional or curriculum modification is made, either the specific subject matter is altered or the performance expected of the student is changed.	IEP-Description of Specially-Designed Instruction-Program Modifications
			NO	The IEP does not describe the type of modifications and the extent of the modifications provided to the child-or-modifications are listed as: “as needed”, “at the discretion of the teacher”, or “as requested by the student”.	
			NA	Based on the needs of the child, modifications were not identified at this time.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-15	300.34 300.320(a)(4)	Does the IEP identify related services that address the needs of the child and support annual goals?	YES	The IEP specifically identifies the provision of related services that aligns with the needs of the child and supports achievement of annual goals. Related Services may include but limited to: speech-language pathology and audiology, interpreting, psychological, physical therapy, occupational therapy, recreation including therapeutic recreation, counseling including rehabilitation, orientation and mobility, social work, health and school nurse.	IEP -Description(s) of Specially-Designed Instruction-Related Services
			NO	The IEP does not specifically identify the provision of related services that aligns with the needs of the child and supports achievement of annual goals.	
			NA	Based on the needs of the child, related services were not identified at this time.	
DS-16	300.320(a)(7)	Does the statement of related services indicate the location, duration, and frequency of the related services?	YES	The IEP specifically indicates the location of where the services will be provided, the duration and frequency.	IEP -Description(s) of Specially-Designed Instruction-Related Services
			NO	The IEP does not specifically indicates the location of where the services will be provided, the duration and frequency.	
			NA	Based on the needs of the child, related services were not identified at this time.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-17	300.324(a)(3)(ii)	Does the IEP include Supports for Personnel to include location, duration, and frequency of supports?	YES	The IEP specifically identify supports for personnel to include location, duration, and frequency of supports.	IEP Description(s) of Specially-Designed Instruction-Support for Personnel
			NO	The IEP does not specifically identify supports for personnel to include location, duration, and frequency of supports.	
			NA	Based on the needs of the child, support for personnel was not identified at this time.	
DS-18	300.320(6)(ii) 300.321(6)(A)	Did the IEP Committee determine the child must take an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or districtwide assessment?	YES	The IEP specifically identifies an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or districtwide assessment.	IEP-Statewide Assessment Program Section IEP-Significant Cognitive Disability Section
			NO	The IEP does not specifically identify an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or districtwide assessment.	
			NA	Student will not take any assessment or will participate in standard assessment.	
		Did the IEP Committee determine the child meets the criteria for Significant Cognitive Disability? (All 3 criterion must be marked as YES to meet SCD)	YES	All three (3) SCD standards are marked as YES.	
			NO	The student is marked as SCD, but all three (3) standards are not marked YES or standard was inappropriately marked as YES.	
		The student is not identified as SCD or will not participate in any State or districtwide assessment.	NA	Does not meet criteria for SCD or will not take any State or districtwide assessment.	
DS-19	300.321(6)(i)	Does the IEP include individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance on State and districtwide assessments?	YES	The IEP includes individual accommodations that are necessary to measure academic achievement and functional performance on State and districtwide assessments.	IEP-Statewide/Districtwide Test Accessibility / Accommodations Sections

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

			NO	The IEP does not include individual accommodations that are necessary to measure academic achievement and functional performance on State and districtwide assessments.	
			NA	The student will not participate in any State or districtwide assessment where individual accommodations are necessary to measure academic achievement and functional performance.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-20 (1)	300.43 SBP 300.320(b)	Does the public agency have in place beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns fourteen (14), or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP Committee, and updated annually, transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the child to meet his or her postsecondary goals?	YES	The IEP contains transition services in the IEP.	IEP-Transition Section
		The public agency does not have in place beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns fourteen (14) transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the child to meet his or her postsecondary goals?	NO	The IEP does not contain transition services in the IEP for a student fourteen (14) or younger if determined appropriate.	
		The child is not fourteen (14) or above. Continue on to DS-21	NA	The child is not fourteen (14) or above. Continue on to DS-21	
DS-20 (2)	300.321(a)(7)(b)	Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Committee meeting where transition services were discussed?	YES	There is documented evidence in the IEP or file that the student was invited to attend the IEP meeting.	IEP-Signature Page Letter inviting the student to attend Notice of Committee Meeting
			NO	There is no documented evidence in the IEP or file that the student was invited to attend the IEP meeting.	
DS-20 (3)	300.320(b) 300.324(c)	Are appropriate measurable postsecondary goals included in the areas of training, education, employment, and where appropriate, independent living skills?	YES	The goals were addressed/updated in conjunction with the IEP.	IEP-Transition Section
			NO	Postsecondary goals are not stated.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-20 (4)	300.321(b)(1)	Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?	YES	Transition assessments used for the postsecondary goals are evident in the student's file.	IEP-Transition Section IEP Indicator 13 Checklist
			NO	Transition assessments used for the postsecondary goals are not evident in the student's file.	
DS-20 (5)	300.43(2)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)	Are there transition services based on the child's needs, taking into account the child's strengths, preferences and interests; and includes a) Instruction b) Related Services c) Community Experiences d) The development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives e) Acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation	YES	There are transition services based on the child's needs, taking into account the child's strengths, preferences and interests; and includes instruction; related services; community experiences; development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives; and acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation.	IEP-Transition Section
			NO	There are no transition services based in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goals or one or more areas mentioned.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-20 (6)	300.320(b)(2)	Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals?	YES	The transition services include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goals.	IEP-Transition Section
			NO	The transition services do not include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goals or there are no course of study listed.	
DS-20 (7)	300.321(b)(3) 300.324(c)	If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?	YES	There is evidence in the IEP that representatives of an outside agency were invited to participate in the IEP development. Prior consent was obtained from the parent (or student who has reached the age of majority).	IEP-Transition Section Outside agency representative may include but not limited to: postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation for the postsecondary goals.
			NO	There is no evidence in the IEP of an outside agency being invited to participate in the IEP meeting. Prior consent was not obtained from parent (or student who has reached the age of majority).	
			NA	An outside agency is not required or appropriate to meet the unique needs of the student.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
DS-21	300.115(a)(b)	Does the IEP Committee consider placement options for the child?	YES	The IEP includes a description of placement options considered while determining the child's LRE.	IEP-Placement Considerations and LRE Determinations Section
			NO	The IEP does not includes a description of placement options considered while determining the child's LRE.	
DS-22	300.320(a)(5)	Does the IEP describe the extent to which the child does not participate with his/her non-disabled peers?	YES	The IEP describes the extent to which the child participates with his/her non-disabled peers.	IEP-Non-participation with Non-Disabled Peers Section
			NO	The IEP does not describe the extent to which the child participates with his/her non-disabled peers.	
			NA	The student receives services at a school/facility that only provides special education services.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
2019/2020 DELIVERY OF SERVICES/FAPE/LRE**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SPB 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Sources of Documentation
FAPE-1	300.106(a)(1)(2)	Does the public agency ensure that extended school year (ESY) services are available as necessary to provide FAPE? If the student is eligible, are targeted goals listed? If regression/recoupment is the criterion, is there evidence of data collection in the student's file? (Refer to the previous year ESY determination review if the audit takes place prior to the determination for the current year)	YES	The ESY determination page has both the documentation of eligibility and the criterion used for determination. If student is eligible, there are targeted goals. If regression/ recoupment is the criterion, there is evidence of appropriate data collection for the required amount of time.	IEP-ESY Determination Page
			NO	The ESY determination page is blank or the following is missing: • eligibility determination • criterion used for determination Regression/Recoupment data (if applicable) is not present in student records. Student is eligible, but there are no targeted goals identified on the IEP.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
DISCIPLINE**

***For students who have been suspended ≥ 10 days or expelled**

Monitor's Name:		Date of Review:		
District:		School:		
Student's Name:		Date of Birth:	Age:	Grade:
Eligibility Category:	Secondary Eligibility:		Eligibility Date:	
NOTES:				

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DIS-1	300.530(e)(1)	Did the public agency conduct a manifestation determination to determine	YES	A manifestation determination was completed by the IEP Committee.	Manifestation Determination Review Form
		a) Conduct was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the child's disability; or b) If the conduct in question was the direct result of the public agency failure to implement the IEP?	NO	A manifestation determination was not completed by the IEP Committee.	Written Prior Notice
DIS-2	300.530(e)(1) 300.530(g) 300.536	Was the manifestation determination conducted within 10 school days of the district's decision to change the placement of a child with a disability? <i>Change of placement is disciplinary removal of a child for violation of student code of conduct and removal if for more than ten consecutive school days or if a series of removals constitute a pattern.</i>	YES	The date of the manifestation determination review is within 10 school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of the child with a disability through a suspension or expulsion.	Student discipline record documenting cumulative days of out-of-school suspension or expulsion, from which the manifestation determination review timeline can be calculated.
		Special Circumstances: 1. Carries a weapon to or possesses a weapon at school, on school premises, or to or at a school function; 2. Knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs, or sells or solicits	NO	The date of the manifestation determination review is more than 10 school days from the date of the decision to change the placement of the child with a disability through a suspension or expulsion.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM

DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥ 10 days or expelled**

		the sale of a controlled substance, while at school, on school premises, or at a school function; 3. Has inflicted serious bodily injury upon another person while at school, on school premises, or at a school function	NA	Special Circumstances: School personnel may remove a student to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than forty-five (45) school days without regard to whether the behavior is determined to be a manifestation of the child's	
				disability for possession of a weapon, possession of or use of illegal drugs, or inflicting serious bodily injury.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM

DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DIS-3	300.530(b)(2)	If required, did the public agency continue to provide services to the	YES	There is evidence regarding the provision of educational	Attendance Records
		student after he or she has been removed from his or her current placement for 10 school days in the same year, during any subsequent days of removal?		services following the tenth day of removal. There is evidence regarding the offer to provide educational services following the tenth day of removal, but the child did not participate in the services.	Service Provider Logs Revisions to the IEP to discuss change in placement Student discipline records documenting cumulative days of out-of-school suspension or expulsion from which the manifestation determination review timeline can be calculated.
			NO	There is no evidence documenting the provision of educational services following the tenth day of removals. The child did not receive educational services.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM

DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DS-4	300.17 300.101 300.530(d)(1)	Did the district conduct a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) after the manifestation determination? (Unless	YES	An FBA is included in the student's file.	Functional Behavior Assessment

	300.530(f)(1)(i)(ii) SBP 300.530(d)	the district conducted the FBA before the behavior that resulted in the change in placement. If the FBA has been developed, did the district review the FBA after the manifestation determination and modify it as necessary to address the child's behavior?)		The FBA meets the requirements of SBP 300.530(d).	
			NO	Disciplinary change of placement that would exceed ten school days is determined not to be a manifestation of the child's disability. Disciplinary change of placement for a violation of a code of conduct to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than forty-five school days for weapons, drugs or serious bodily injury.	
			NA	The IEP Committee determined that the conduct was not a manifestation of the student's disability.	

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4**

RULE 74.19

ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM

DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DIS-5	SBP 300.530(d)(1)(ii)(a)	Did the FBA meet the requirements of SBP 300.530(d) by including:		A Functional Behavior Assessment is an assessment utilized to evaluate a child's behavior and determine the	Functional Behavior Assessment
		a) A clear description of the problematic behavior;	YES		
			NO		
		b) Identification of the antecedent events, times, and situations that predict when the problem behavior will not occur;	YES	purpose or function of that behavior. The result of an FBA must lead to the development/modification and implementation of a behavior intervention plan.	
			NO		
		c) Identification and consequences of the problem behavior;	YES		
			NO		
		d) Development of hypotheses and summary statements that describe the problem behavior and its functions;	YES		
			NO		
		e) Collection of data from a variety of sources: interviews, direct observation data, etc.	YES		
			NO		

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DIS-6	300.17 300.101 300.530(d)(1)	Did the district develop a behavioral intervention plan (BIP) for the child as a result of the FBA?	YES	A BIP is included in the student's file.	Behavior Intervention Plan
	300.530(f)(1)	OR If the BIP had already been developed, did the district review the BIP after the manifestation determination and modify it as necessary to address the child's behavior?	NO	A BIP is <u>not</u> included in the student's file. The BIP is included, but it does not meet the requirements of SBP 300.530(d).	
			NA	The team determined that the conduct was not a manifestation of the student's disability.	

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARD 17.4
RULE 74.19
ON-SITE MONITORING RECORD REVIEW FORM
DISCIPLINE

***For students who have been suspended ≥10 days or expelled**

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 C.F.R. or SBP 74.19	Record Review Question	Compliant	Evidence	Potential Source(s) of Documentation
DIS-7	SBP 300.530(d)(1)(ii)	Did the BIP meet the requirements of SBP 300.530(d) by including ALL of the following?		A Behavior Intervention Plan must use the information gathered from the FBA to develop a concrete plan of	Functional Behavior Assessment
		a) Observable and measurable	YES		
		description of the problem behavior;	NO	action for improving student's behavior.	
		b) Identified purpose of the problem behavior as a result of the FBA;	YES		
			NO		
		c) General strategy or combination of strategies for changing problem behavior;	YES		
			NO		
		d) Written description of when, where, and how often the strategy will be implemented;	YES		
			NO		
		e) Consistent system for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.	YES		
			NO		