



## Protocol – Indicator 12

### Essential Elements

#### Indicator Description

Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

#### Measurement

1. 12a.# of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part eligibility determination.
2. 12b.# of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
3. 12c.# of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
4. 12d.# of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
5. 12e.# of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
6. 12f.# of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

#### 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.

Over summer 2023 there will be intense stakeholder feedback over Indicator 12.

#### Target Setting:

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. Transition Coordinators, Office of Special Education, collect and validate postsecondary outcomes data; provide technical assistance to LEAs on transition requirements; ensure accuracy of transition-related data in MSIS 2.0 and SharePoint.
5. 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.
6. 619 Coordinator, Office of Special Education, oversees IDEA Section 618 data collection and reporting; ensures accuracy and completeness of all federal



submissions; collaborates with OSE and OTSS staff to align 618 data with SPP/APR indicators.

7. 619 Specialist, Office of Special Education, supports the 618 Coordinator with data validation and file preparation; maintains documentation for audit compliance; assists with trend analysis and technical assistance to districts.
8. 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.
9. 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. If data are from state monitoring, describe the method the SEA uses to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a state database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Data comes from MSIS 2.0 and includes the entire reporting year.

MSIS 2.0 imports data from MS Department of Health for children transitioning from Part C to B on a weekly basis.

#### State Collection and Submission Schedule:

Data collection happens on a rolling basis. The reporting year is from July 1- June 30.

Data is completed June 30.

After the end of the school year, OTSS sends the data upon request (target date is August 15).

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting send the letters to each district by September 1.

Noncompliance is corrected by October 1.

Indicator data is received from LEAs in November – January each year.

#### Collection:

Describe the method the SEA uses to collect these data, and if data are from the state's monitoring, describe the procedure the state uses to collect these data.



The Part C Early Intervention Coordinator provides regular data uploads from the Part C system to MSIS 2.0, which include batches of student records for children transitioning from early intervention (Part C) to preschool special education (Part B). These uploads are intended to occur weekly; however, because the process is manual, the frequency may vary. Each upload is expected to include children who are actively receiving early intervention services at 27 months of age. Ongoing system enhancements aim to ensure that only children currently receive services are included.

Each student record transmitted from Part C should contain a district number to associate the child with the correct LEA.

For each student appearing on the Part C to B Report, the district must upload the status of the student, including IEP dates, MSIS IDs, and/or reasons for not evaluating or serving the student.

The OSE Data and Reporting Team maintains a list of noncompliant districts for internal tracking and follow-up. This list is stored in the shared spreadsheet used for annual state-level data reconciliation and reporting to OTSS.

#### **Data Validation:**

Following the end of the school year, the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) provides the OSE Data and Reporting Team with the Indicator 12 data upon request, typically by August 15. OTSS sends a district-level spreadsheet listing all students who appear to be noncompliant based on MSIS 2.0 data. The OSE Data and Reporting Team extracts this information and prepares individual Excel reports for each district.

A clarification letter is then emailed to each district's Special Education Director by the OSE Data and Reporting Team, and the corresponding district report is uploaded to the district's secure folder on the state's SharePoint site. These letters follow a memo format and do not require signatures. Each letter identifies the number of students who did not have an IEP in place on their third birthday, allowing districts to review their records and provide any missing Indicator 12 Opportunity for Clarification Forms. Districts are given 30 calendar days to respond and submit the required documentation. Indicator 12 forms also allow districts to indicate whether an IEP was developed late and to provide an explanation.

After the new forms are received and updates are made in MSIS 2.0, the OSE Data and Reporting Team updates the original noncompliance spreadsheet and returns the finalized version to OTSS for recordkeeping and reporting. If a district fails to respond within 30 days, the clarification letter is resent, and the district superintendent is copied on the correspondence. Once a district is determined to be fully compliant and all Indicator 12 data have been updated, a notification of compliance is sent to the district.



If noncompliance remains, the district receives a notification of noncompliance that identifies the remaining issues and explains the next steps for corrective action.

All identified noncompliance must be corrected by October 1 (Month 3) of the following school year. If there are data quality concerns, the district must provide additional documentation to support corrections. For example, if there are multiple students listed with an “unknown” status, the district may be required to submit evidence such as records of communication with Part C (First Steps) staff, parent outreach logs, MET meeting documentation, or a Replication of Services form. The OSE Data and Reporting Team reviews additional evidence to verify accuracy before finalizing compliance determinations in MSIS 2.0.

#### **Data Analysis:**

A master tracking spreadsheet of noncompliant districts is maintained by the OSE Data and Reporting Team for documentation and monitoring purposes. This spreadsheet, which is also shared with the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS), is used to reconcile updates and track the status of district corrections throughout the clarification period.

The OTSS Data Analyst uses the finalized spreadsheet to compile and calculate the official Indicator 12 data. Detailed instructions and a standardized worksheet guide to the analyst in categorizing and summarizing results across compliance and noncompliance categories. Once verified, these data are entered into the SPP/APR Reporting Tool and incorporated into the District Determination Reports for statewide publication and federal reporting.

#### **Response to OSEP-Required Actions:**

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance reviews all required actions and feedback received from OSEP following the state’s SPP/APR submission. The Director of Special Education and the Education Program Administrator meet to discuss the feedback, determine necessary revisions, and identify any corrective actions to be implemented. Once revisions are finalized, they are reviewed, approved, and incorporated into the appropriate procedures or reports to ensure continued compliance with OSEP requirements.

As needed, the Education Program Administrator also consults with the 619 Coordinator to review preschool-related components and ensure that all Part B and Part C transition requirements are accurately reflected in the state’s response.



### Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance:

The Director of Integrated Monitoring Systems (IMS) and the IMS Team issue a written notification of noncompliance within 90 days of the identification of the noncompliance. When a finding of noncompliance is issued to an LEA, the LEA must correct the noncompliance (student-level) as soon as possible, but no later than one year (365 days) from the date of notification. The MDE OSE also requires LEAs to provide evidence from additional student files for review by the MDE OSE. This final review is in place to ensure verification of system-level compliance. Failure to provide system-level assurance will require additional probing. When noncompliance is identified, the LEA may be assigned required professional development (PD) based on the issue of noncompliance and historical data showing long-standing noncompliance issues. In extreme and ongoing cases of noncompliance, the LEA will be required to complete a self-assessment to identify the root cause of the area(s) of noncompliance, and the LEA may be required to develop an improvement plan, which may involve the review and revision of policies, practices, and procedures.

### 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 finalized datasets and federal reporting requirements. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance provide the corresponding narrative responses, including explanations for slippage, improvement activities, and corrective actions, to complete the state's SPP/APR submission.

### Clarification:

The OTSS Data Analyst enters the validated data into the SPP/APR Reporting Tool, ensuring that all figures align with finalized datasets and federal reporting requirements. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance provide the accompanying narrative responses, including explanations for slippage, improvement strategies, and any required corrective actions, to complete the indicator submission.

### Data Governance:



Mississippi has an established data governance committee and procedures that outline the process for change control. Any changes to data collection 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 review 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](http://mdek12.org)  
[\(mdek12.org\)](http://mdek12.org)

Indicators 12 are included in the Determination Report.

District determinations help to identify indicators for coaching.