

Protocol - Exiting Essential Elements

Data Collection Name:

MOE-CEIS

EDFacts File Numbers

1. Submitted via *EMAPS*

Data Stewards:

Executive Director, Office of Special Education, Provides final review, approval, and certification of all SPP/APR submissions and related data reports.

1. Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting / Part B Data Manager, Office of Special Education, oversees data collection, validation, and analysis; coordinates timelines and ensures compliance with IDEA and federal reporting requirements; serves as primary liaison with Partner Support and OSEP.
2. Data and Reporting Data Specialists, Office of Special Education, conduct data collection and validation; analyze district-level data; provide technical assistance to LEAs; ensure data accuracy in SharePoint and related systems.
3. IDEA Fiscal Support, Office of Special Education, once district identified with significant disproportionality he modifies MCAPS ([MCAPS Home \(mdek12.org\)](http://mdek12.org)) to pull the districts' 15% from their budget, provide programmatic support with districts to create budgets for CCEIS and approve their CCEIS budget
4. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting, Office of Technology and Strategic Services, pulls data from backend systems for Indicators 1–14; compiles data for the APR and LEA determinations; ensures consistency across state data systems.
5. EDFacts Coordinators, Office of Technology and Strategic Services, maintain EDFacts file specifications, formatting, and submission requirements; ensure alignment of all data files with federal reporting standards.
6. Grants Manager, Office of Grants Management, receives data from OTSS and special education and determines calculations for special education and 619 funds. Districts that are required to reserve 15% for CCEIS enter information into MCAPS.
7. Grants Analyst, Office of Grants Management, determines whether districts met maintenance of effort. Received info from financial services to determine compliance and eligibility.
8. Grant management specialist, Office of Grants Management, handles fiscal part – create the allocations and enter the data in MCAPS

Data Collection Levels:

LEA/ESA level

- a. Fiscal
- b. Monitoring
- c. Student level

Federal Reporting Period and Submission Dates:

- 1. Due Date: First Wednesday in May.

State Collection and Submission Schedule:

SEA Collection and Submission Schedule (3)

The Office of Special Education (OSE) follows a structured timeline for data collection and submission to ensure data accuracy and federal compliance. The following schedule outlines key phases for each data collection:

Collection Activity	Description	Date/Timeframe
Data Collection Window Opens	LEAs begin entering and verifying data within the state's data system (MSIS).	August 15
LEA Data Submission Due to SEA	LEAs must finalize and certify submissions to the SEA by this date.	September 30
SEA Data Verification & Pull	SEA reviews, validates, and officially extracts ("pulls") data for analysis and federal reporting.	October 1 – October 15

Additional Notes:

- 1. LEAs receive advance notification of opening and closing dates through official OSE communications.
- 2. Any extensions or corrections are handled during a short correction window following the close of the collection.
- 3. SEA ensures that final verified data is stored and locked before submission to OSEP.

PROCESSES

Collection:

Maintenance of Effort (MOE) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) Procedures — Mississippi Department of Education

When the MOE/CEIS survey window opens, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance distribute a data element “cheat sheet” to key staff members across divisions. This resource outlines all data components, identifies the offices responsible, and references the shared MOE/CEIS data collection chart for coordination between the Office of Special Education (OSE), Office of School Financial Services, and the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS).

Maintenance of Effort (MOE)

LEAs report financial data annually through the Financial Exchange Transaction System (FETS), documenting all state, local, and federal expenditures. The submission deadline for LEAs is October 15.

The Fiscal Data Analyst obtains the Child Count data from the OSE Data and Reporting Team, which receives the official EDFacts child count file from OTSS. The Fiscal Services Office also requests and receives the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) data from OTSS. These data elements are used to calculate total allocations for Part B 611 (A2A – prior year, A2B – reporting year) and Part B 619 (A3B – reporting year), typically completed in May.

Each March–April, the Office of School Financial Services generates the MOE Compliance Report from FETS. This report is compared to the previous year’s compliance data to determine whether each LEA has maintained or increased its level of state and local financial support for the education of children with disabilities.

1. B5: Determines whether the state assessed LEA compliance.
2. B6: Determines whether the LEA met the MOE compliance standard.
3. B3: Identifies reductions in state or local funding.
4. B7/B8: Reports if a district was required to return funds and the corresponding repayment amount.

The baseline year for comparison is the last year the LEA met compliance, and the LEA must maintain at least that same level of effort in subsequent years.

Following completion of the SPP/APR in March, the OTSS Data Analyst generates a determinations report using SQL, which includes district-level data for total enrollment, child count, FRPL, indicators, and overall, LEA determination status (B2). These data feed into both the District Determination Reports and the annual risk assessment for monitoring tier assignments. The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting produce PDF reports for each LEA, which are posted publicly on the MDE website.

SPP/APR - <https://mdek12.org/specialeducation/spp-apr/>

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

Each spring, OTSS runs the Significant Disproportionality Calculator from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to identify districts required to reserve 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for CEIS (C2A). A comprehensive spreadsheet of identified districts and categories is shared with the Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance for verification. After review, the final version is sent to the Fiscal Services Office for upload to MCAPS in March/April.

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance then pull reports directly from MCAPS to verify the amount required to reserve for CEIS (C2B) and generates a list of districts voluntarily implementing CEIS (C3A) along with their voluntary reservation amounts (C3B). These data are reviewed and finalized during the MOE/CEIS submission period.

For student-level CEIS data, LEAs report the number of students receiving CEIS in the reporting year and the number of those students identified for special education within the following two school years (D2 and D3). Previously, LEAs submitted this information using a Word-based reporting form, which was uploaded into MCAPS. The state is now transitioning to the IDC MOE/CEIS Tracking Tool, which allows districts to upload directly to SharePoint and enables the state to aggregate and analyze submissions within the tool. During this transition, a hybrid reporting process is being used, with some districts continuing to submit Word forms while others fully implement the IDC tool.

Districts must upload their CEIS data by September 30 each year, aligned with MCAPS funding application timelines set by OSE. Once all data are validated, the OSE Data and Reporting Team and Fiscal Services Office verify that CEIS and MOE reporting requirements are met prior to submission in the SPP/APR.

IDEA SSS Considerations:¹

Definition of Significant Disproportionality

Data Validation:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance review the list of districts identified with significant disproportionality and manually examines the raw data to verify that each district was correctly flagged based on the established criteria. The administrator also validates the MOE/CEIS report using the IDC MOE/CEIS Edit Check Tool to ensure data accuracy and alignment with federal reporting requirements. The OSE Data and Reporting Team, including data analysts and specialists, independently reviews the report to identify any inconsistencies or potential errors before the data are finalized for submission.

Internal Approval Process:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance notify the Director of Special Education when the materials are ready, offers the opportunity for review, and copies the Grants Management Team.

Submission:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance submit the finalized file in MCAPS (<https://mcaps.mdek12.org/>) . If any technical or submission issues occur, the administrator coordinates with the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting for assistance in resolving them. The administrator also documents any relevant updates in the “Additional Information” section of MCAPS, such as district changes resulting from new charter school openings or district consolidations, to ensure accurate recordkeeping and reporting.

Response to OSEP Data Quality Report:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance consults with the person or office responsible for that data element.

Data Governance:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance present the changes to the state’s data governance committee and needs to be approved by the committee.

Public Reporting:

MCAPS is publicly accessible and includes CEIS data.

#	DATA COLLECTION FOR MOE AND CEIS SURVEY	DATA SOURCE
1	Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 FFY 2024 (A2A)	The total allocation will be found in the FY25 (SY 24–25) project application that contains the total allocations for Section 611 (MCAPS – OSE).
2	Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 FFY 2025 (A2B)	The total allocation will be found in the FY26 (SY 25–26) project application that contains the total allocation for Section 611 (MCAPS – OSE).
3	Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 619 FFY 2025	The total allocation will be found in the FY26 (SY 25–26) project application that contains the total allocation for Section 619 (MCAPS – OSE).
4	What year’s data were used to make LEA/ESA Determinations in your state (B2Year)	2024–2025
5	The determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may reduce MOE during SY 2024–2025 (B2)	All LEAs should be “Meets Requirements.” Identify any LEA that did not meet requirements during SY 2024–2025 (Office of Grants Management).
6	Reduction of local and/or state funds pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during SY 2024–2025 (B3)	Identify any LEA that was able to reduce local and/or state funds during SY 2024–2025 (Office of Grants Management).
7	Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2024/SY 2024–2025 (B5)?	Each LEA is notified annually; therefore, all should have “Yes.” OGM will notify OSE if a determination was



		not made for one or more LEAs (OGM).
8	Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2024/SY 2024–2025 (B6)?	Identify any LEA that did not meet the MOE compliance standard for SY 2024–2025 (OGM).
9	By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2024/SY 2024–2025 (B7)?	Identify any LEA required to return non-Federal funds due to MOE noncompliance (OGM).
10	What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2024/SY 2024–2025 (B8)?	Record the total amount of non-Federal funds returned for MOE noncompliance (OGM).
11	Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2024–2025 (C2A)?	Identified through a report in MCAPS (FY26 / SY 2024–2025) by OSE.
12	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to identification as a child with a disability? (C2A.1)	This information is in the FY26 CEIS spreadsheet that details categories of identification (OSE shared drive).
13	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to identification by disability category? (C2A.2)	This information is in the FY26 CEIS spreadsheet (OSE shared drive).
14	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to placement in a particular educational setting? (C2A.3)	This information is in the FY26 CEIS spreadsheet (OSE shared drive).
15	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to disciplinary action? (C2A.4)	This information is in the FY26 CEIS spreadsheet (OSE shared drive).



16	Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in SY 2024–2025 (C2B)	Found in the FY26 (SY 2024–2025) funding application; Row 2 of the CEIS page in MCAPS for Sections 619 and 611 (MCAPS – OSE).
17	Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2024–2025? (C3A)	LEAs identified as “Voluntary CEIS” will have designated amounts in Row 3 and “Voluntary” status in Row 4 of the FY26 CEIS page (MCAPS – OSE).
18	Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in SY 2024–2025 (C3B)	Found in Row 3 of the CEIS page for Sections 611 and 619 in the FY26 (SY 2024–2025) funding application (MCAPS – OSE).
19	Total number of children receiving CEIS under IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2024–2025 (D2)	Found in the CEIS Report (column 1) in Related Documents in the FY26 funding application (MCAPS – OSE).
20	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA anytime in the past two years (including SY 2022–2023, SY 2023–2024, and SY 2024–2025) and who received special education and related services in SY 2024–2025 (D3)	Found in the CEIS Report (columns 2 and 3 combined) in Related Documents in the FY26 funding application (MCAPS – OSE).