

Protocol – Indicator 11

Essential Elements

Indicator Description

Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the state establishes a time frame within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that time frame.

Measurement

1. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
2. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or state-established timeline).

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicate if the state has established a timeline and, if so, what is the state's timeline for initial evaluations.

Stakeholder Engagement:

Special ED Advisory panel is used for stakeholder engagement. Meetings with the advisory panel are held monthly via Zoom or in-person. The advisory panel helps with targets and suggestions for training with districts and dissemination. Official minutes must be kept on all SEAP meetings and must be made available to the public on request.

For target and baseline setting for results indicators:

1. There was a series of virtual meetings with parents and for the public to review data and set targets. Special education directors are also included.
2. There are 12 parents of a child with a disability and 4 parent members of organizations out of 27 members on the panel that engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement activities, and evaluating progress.
3. Attendance is tracked by roll call at the beginning of each meeting, and members are marked present or absent on an attendance form. The Research Specialist takes roll and provides the parent engage
4. In-person training was provided to all panel members on October 22, 2025, from the Program Director, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) at Utah State University. Topics included:
 - a. Purpose for the Special Education Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - b. Knowing and Understanding the Panel By-laws
 - c. IDEA Regulations Regarding the Advisory Panel



- d. The Panel in the Context of the History of Special Education
 - e. The Relationships Between Part C of IDEA, Section 619, and Part B of IDEA
 - f. Required Membership of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - g. Working as an Advisory Panel
 - h. Duties of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - i. Panel Meeting Procedures
 - j. The Panel and OSEP Related Items – General Supervision/APR and DMS
 - k. Establishing Annual Advisory Panel Priorities
 - l. Current Issues in Special Education and their Possible Impact on the Advisory Panel
5. These meetings were advertised on website, flyers were sent to districts for students to take home to parents, districts and parent centers were also notified regarding virtual meetings.
 6. There was a series of ~7 zoom meetings, to collect feedback and answer questions. There was an overview of the indicators, and historical data was presented to review trends. Suggested targets were provided, and comments were recorded. Questions and comments centered on actual data and how the data impacts children. Chat and verbal discussion were used to collect feedback.
 7. Meetings are held on weekends, evenings, and at lunch to maximize the availability of people. These were held from November through January.
 8. Meets at least four times per year.
 - a. Solicits nominations for membership from interested parties, including parents.
 - b. These meetings serve as the primary mechanism for gathering input on target settings, data analysis, and strategy development. The timeline is aligned with the administrative year (July 1 – June 30).
 9. An annual report of SEAP activities and suggestions to the SEA, which must be made publicly available.
 10. Results of meetings, target settings, and data analysis etc. are discussed in the APR.

There is also an annual parent conference in partnership with the Mississippi Parent Training and Information Center, which is also open to teachers and directors. The data are presented during the conference, and targets are discussed during this meeting.

Target Setting: This is a compliance indicator.

Target must be 100%

Online SPP/APR Submission Tool Information:

The Director of Special Education, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance, the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting, and designated OTSS developers have access to the SPP/APR Tool with permission to submit and edit the report. The Director of Special Education authorizes user access, while the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting manage user accounts and coordinates communication with Partner Support regarding access and technical issues.

Users with access to the tool login here: <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>

Data Stewards:

1. Executive Director, Office of Special Education, provides final review, approval, and certification of all SPP/APR submissions and related data reports.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Director of Policy and Practice, Office of Special Education, reviews data and reports for alignment with state policies and program requirements; assists with interpreting results and developing improvement strategies.
5. Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support, Office of Special Education, monitors timelines and accuracy of dispute-resolution data; ensures cases are logged and closed correctly in SharePoint; oversees parent-engagement activities and procedural-safeguard compliance.
6. 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.
7. 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.

Data Source Description:

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

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

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

MSIS 2.0 data is used for Indicator 11. All LEAs are included. MSIS 2.0 receives special education data in 3 different ways. The majority of data is received via API directly through LEAs' IEP vendors. LEAs who do not have an IEP vendor complete file uploads to import data into MSIS 2.0. Finally, students who are served but not enrolled in the LEA are entered and updated through a manual input screen (Non-Public Student Update). Data for Indicator 11 comes from the evaluation datasets collected via API and File Upload.

Mississippi uses the 60-day timeline.

State Collection and Submission Schedule:

Please refer to the Districts begin submitting data nightly to MSIS 2.0 in August. Evaluation data for Indicator 11 is collected throughout the school year and is certified by June 30.

Collection:

Indicator 11 – Child Find: Data Capture, Validation, and Clarification (MSIS 2.0).

Districts enter and update Child Find data on an ongoing basis and must ensure all entries are complete by June 30 each school year. At any time, an LEA may run the Child Find Data Compliance Report in MSIS 2.0 which lists students and indicates whether timelines were met. Ahead of the June 30 deadline, the OSE Data and Reporting Team reminds districts to run compliance reports and resolve outstanding issues.

MSIS 2.0 supports entry of allowable exceptions to the 60-day timeline—such as a written agreement (e.g., SLD-specific extension), parent failure to produce the child, or the child moving during the process—and automatically flags records that exceed the 60-day evaluation requirement.

Each October, the OTSS Data Analyst and the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting generate a statewide MSIS 2.0 extract identifying districts that require clarification and upload the spreadsheet to the secure MDE SharePoint location. The OSE Data Team is notified and uses this extract—which includes district identifiers, student names/IDs (as permitted), key dates (referral, consent, permission to test), and noncompliance flags—to prepare district-specific packets with MSIS IDs and student-level data. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance emails each LEA’s special education director to indicate that the letter and data are available in SharePoint, noting the counts evaluated within timelines and those that missed timelines, and sets a response deadline of November 30.

Districts complete the Indicator 11 Opportunity for Clarification student form for each flagged record and upload the forms to SharePoint by November 30, then notify the OSE Data Team that the submission is ready for review. (Form link: <https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/Offices/MDE/OAE/OSE/SPP-APR/indicator-11-opportunity-for-clarification-form.pdf>.) If dates were entered incorrectly, the district can update MSIS 2.0 during the clarification window; if an allowable exception applies, the district provides supporting documentation. Failure to respond by November 30 results in the district being considered noncompliant. If multiple records appear to involve incorrect dates, the OSE Data Team conducts an additional inquiry before finalizing the status.

OTSS maintains step-by-step SQL and APR procedures (including queries for Indicator 11) in the APR folder for staff use and continuity of operations:

<https://mdek12.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/SpecialEducation-MDE/EuAOslikO49MlrGoeUgRYsB2ULYAnM8LpnnaBGIEQjdww?e=zLSxWd>

Data Validation:

At the data collection level, MSIS 2.0 automatically generates flags when a district exceeds the 60-day evaluation timeline. Districts may make updates to the data up until the certification in June. The clarification period serves as the formal data validation phase, during which Indicator 11 Clarification Forms are collected from LEAs. This allows districts to document and correct any errors identified in their initial submissions, including incorrect or missing dates related to the evaluation process.

During the review of clarification submissions, the OSE Data and Reporting Team examines each case where the district has reported a possible date of error. The team verifies the accuracy of reported dates by requesting supporting documentation, such as Assessment Team reports and IEPs, to confirm when evaluations were completed and eligibility decisions were made. This verification ensures that all corrections are evidence-based and compliant with data quality standards.

Following established procedures outlined in the SQL for APR documentation, the OTSS Data Analyst conducts a final data validation review. This includes checking non-initial evaluation codes, confirming that each LEA appropriately holds ownership of the student in the data system, and removing any duplicate student records from the dataset. The analyst also reviews the final spreadsheet to ensure that all data correspond to the correct reporting year and removes any extraneous or next-year dates prior to finalizing the Indicator 11 dataset for reporting.

Data Analysis:

The OTSS Data Analyst completes the data analysis for Indicator 11 following the SQL for APR procedures, calculating the total number of students who received parental consent for evaluation and the number who completed the evaluation within the 60-day timeline. The analyst also identifies and counts the students who were noncompliant with the timeline requirement to populate the SPP/APR reporting tool accurately.

When slippage is identified in the state's SPP/APR results, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance consults with the OSE Programmatic Team to analyze the data, identify trends, and determine the underlying causes of the slippage. The team reviews findings and contributing factors during scheduled meetings and uses this information to guide technical assistance, professional development, and system improvement efforts.

Response to OSEP-Required Actions:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance reviews all required actions and feedback received from OSEP. The Director of Special Education and the Education Program Administrator meet to discuss the feedback, determine necessary revisions, and identify any required corrective actions. Once revisions are finalized, they are reviewed, approved, and implemented to ensure compliance with OSEP requirements and alignment with the state's improvement priorities.

Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance:

~~LEAs are required to correct any student-specific findings of noncompliance as soon as possible and must notify the OSE Data and Reporting Team once the corrections have been made (systematic verification).~~

~~For districts that were identified with noncompliance during Month 3 (October), the OSE Data and Reporting Team conducts a Prong 2 review the following year to confirm that no similar noncompliance occurred during the same reporting period. This ensures that corrective actions were both implemented and sustained over time.~~

~~If continued noncompliance is identified, the OSE Data and Reporting Team contacts the district to provide targeted technical assistance (TA) and support the development of an improvement plan to address the area of concern. When necessary, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) may also be required to ensure full compliance and ongoing improvement.~~

The Director of Integrated Monitoring Systems (IMS) and the IMS Team issue a written notification of noncompliance to the LEA within 90 days of the identification of noncompliance. When a finding of noncompliance is issued, the LEA is required to correct the student-level noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year (365 days) from the date of the written notification.

In addition to correcting individual student findings, the Mississippi Department of Education Office of Special Education (MDE OSE) requires LEAs to submit evidence from additional student files for review. This subsequent review is conducted to verify system-level (systemic) compliance, ensuring that the policies, procedures, and practices contributing to the noncompliance have been effectively implemented and are preventing recurrence.

For districts that had noncompliance identified during Month 3 (October), the OSE Data and Reporting Team conducts a systemic review in the following year during the same reporting period to confirm that similar noncompliance did not recur. This review verifies that corrective actions were not only completed at the individual student level, but were sustained over time at the system level.

If system-level assurance cannot be verified or if continued noncompliance is identified, the OSE Data and Reporting Team will conduct additional probing and contact the district to provide targeted technical assistance. Based on the nature of the noncompliance and historical data indicating long-standing issues, the LEA may be assigned required professional development aligned to the area of concern.

In cases of extreme or ongoing noncompliance, the LEA may be required to complete a self-assessment to identify root causes and may be required to develop an improvement plan, which could include the review and revision of policies, practices, and procedures. When warranted, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) may also be required to ensure full compliance and continuous improvement.

Internal Approval Process:

Data Team provides a first pass review of the indicator to see if anything should be added. Then, the director reviews the SPP/APR and submits the final report.

Submission:

The OTSS Data Analyst enters the validated data into the SPP/APR Reporting Tool, ensuring that all figures align with the finalized datasets. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance provides the accompanying narrative responses, including explanations for slippage and descriptions of improvement activities, to complete the indicator submission.

Clarification:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance review all OSEP requests and comments for clarification and drafts the corresponding state responses. An internal tracking chart is created listing each OSEP comment alongside the proposed state response. The chart is shared with the Director of Special Education and the appropriate program area specialists for review and feedback prior to submission. Finalized responses are then entered into the SPP/APR Reporting Tool during the clarification period.

Data Governance:

Mississippi has an established data governance committee and procedures that outlines the process for change control. Any changes to data collections must be formally submitted to the Change Review Board, a subset of the data governance committee and voted upon and approved by data owners.

Public Reporting:

District Determination Reports are generated each spring and posted on the MDE website, typically in April or May, in PDF or Excel format. The OTSS Data Team and the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting compile and prepare the reports for publication. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance reviews the reports for accuracy and completeness before requesting that the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) post the finalized versions.

These are posted here: [SPP/APR | The Mississippi Department of Education \(mdek12.org\)](https://mdek12.org)

Indicators 11 is included in determinations.

District determinations help to identify indicators for coaching