

Protocol – Indicator 18

Essential Elements

Indicator Description

Percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

1. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023)
2. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance

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

Additional notes included in the measurement table instructions:

1. Based on findings of noncompliance issued the prior FFY, the state will report in
2. Column A: the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023)
3. Column B: the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance
4. Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.
5. States have the option to also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators (e.g., results indicators, including related requirements, fiscal, dispute resolution, etc.).
6. If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform

Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for
Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Target Setting

Targets must be 100.0%.

Online SPP/APR Submission Tool Information

Describe login information, including

1. Director of Data, OSE
 - a. Super User
 - b. how to gain access for additional staff
 - c. how to access online SPP/APR submission tool support
2. Additional Staff will include: (Read Only)
 - a. Director of Programs
 - b. Coordinator of Supports and Professional Development
 - c. Executive Director, Interim
 - d. Director of Integrated Monitoring
 - e. Director of Parent Engagement/Compliance

Data Stewards

- a. Executive Director, Office of Special Education, provides final review, approval, and certification of all SPP/APR submissions and related data reports.
- b. 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.
- c. 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.
- d. 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.
- e. 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

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), uses multiple integrated data systems and monitoring processes to collect, analyze, and verify data for this indicator. The data sources include the state's electronic data collection platforms, fiscal management systems, and documentation collected through

monitoring and dispute resolution activities. These systems work together as part of MDE's general supervision system to identify, verify, and correct noncompliance.

Primary Data Systems

1. Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS):
 - a. Serves as the state's primary data system for student-level information, including special education eligibility, placement, discipline, and exiting data. MSIS provides the foundation for many compliance indicators and is used to validate student records and outcomes.
2. SharePoint System – Office of Special Education:
 - a. Used to manage, track, and store documentation for dispute resolution, state complaints, due process hearings, and corrective actions. It houses supporting documentation for Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 and maintains district submissions related to CCEIS, PPP Reviews, and improvement activities.
3. SharePoint Database – Dispute Resolution:
 - a. Maintained by the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) to record details of complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings. This database supports cross-checking between dispute resolution outcomes and compliance indicators.
4. Fiscal Management System / IDEA Part B Grant Database:
 - a. Tracks fiscal data related to IDEA allocations, expenditures, and CEIS/CCEIS requirements. It is used to ensure compliance with fiscal monitoring requirements and to document findings of fiscal noncompliance.
5. Monitoring and Self-Assessment Platforms:
 - a. The OSE's monitoring team uses structured desk audits, self-assessments, and on-site monitoring tools to identify findings of noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements. Data from these reviews are recorded in SharePoint and tracked for correction and verification.

Sources of Findings of Noncompliance

Findings of noncompliance are identified through multiple mechanisms within the state's general supervision system, including:

1. State monitoring activities (desk audits, self-assessments, on-site reviews);
2. Data reviews using MSIS, SharePoint, and EDFacts submissions;
3. Dispute resolution systems (complaints, mediations, due process hearings);
4. Fiscal monitoring and audits; and
5. Review of district submissions related to CCEIS and improvement plans.

Each finding is documented within the appropriate data system and assigned for correction tracking by the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager and Data and Reporting Data Specialists.

Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements

Data related to Part B SPP/APR requirements are sourced from multiple oversight activities coordinated by the Office of Special Education (OSE) and the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS). Monitoring activities include:

1. Desk audits and data verification reviews for indicator accuracy;
2. On-site monitoring visits to validate compliance with IDEA procedural requirements;
3. Fiscal reviews to ensure allowable use of IDEA Part B funds; and
4. Dispute resolution tracking for any findings related to procedural safeguards.

Additional Findings

In addition to compliance indicators, MDE documents other findings of noncompliance related to results indicators, fiscal compliance, and dispute resolution outcomes. These findings are logged, tracked, and verified for correction through the OSE's general supervision system, ensuring full compliance with IDEA Section 616 and 618 requirements.

Collection

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), collects data on findings of noncompliance through multiple components of the state's general supervision system, including monitoring, data review, fiscal oversight, and dispute resolution processes. These activities ensure timely identification, verification, and correction of noncompliance across all local educational agencies (LEAs).

Origin and Collection Process

Data on potential or confirmed findings of noncompliance originate from several sources:

1. Monitoring activities, including self-assessments, desk audits, on-site monitoring visits, and data verification reviews;
2. Fiscal monitoring and audits conducted through the IDEA Part B Fiscal Management System;
3. Dispute resolution systems, including written complaints, mediations, and due process hearing decisions; and
4. OSE data system reviews, which examine patterns and discrepancies within the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) and related databases.

5. All monitoring activities are coordinated and documented in the OSE's SharePoint-based data system, which serves as the central repository for tracking findings, corrective actions, and verification of correction.
6. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager oversees the overall collection, review, and coordination of data related to noncompliance for both indicator-specific and general supervision findings.

All monitoring activities are coordinated and documented in the OSE's SharePoint-based data system, which serves as the central repository for tracking findings, corrective actions, and verification of correction.

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager oversees the overall collection, review, and coordination of data related to noncompliance for both indicator-specific and general supervision findings.

Personnel Responsible for Data Collection

The 618 Coordinator and 618 Specialist support the data manager by ensuring consistency between monitoring data, MSIS data, and EDFacts submissions.

1. The Data and Reporting Data Specialists conduct detailed reviews of district submissions, collect documentation of noncompliance, and provide technical assistance to LEAs.
2. The Director of Policy and Practice reviews findings for alignment with IDEA requirements and ensures that corrective actions address root causes of noncompliance.
3. The Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support and the Parent Engagement Specialist collect and review data from state complaints and due process hearings related to procedural safeguards.
4. The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting within the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) extracts monitoring, fiscal, and dispute resolution data from backend systems to support annual federal reporting.

Collection of Indicator-Specific Noncompliance

For compliance indicators (e.g., Indicators 9–13), findings are identified through systematic monitoring activities, including:

1. Desk audits and data reviews conducted by the OSE Data and Reporting Team;
2. Self-assessments submitted by districts through SharePoint;
3. On-site monitoring visits coordinated by OSE staff; and
4. Fiscal monitoring conducted jointly by OSE and OTSS to ensure proper use of IDEA Part B funds.

Each finding is documented in SharePoint, assigned a correction timeline, and tracked until verification of correction is completed.

Collection of Findings for Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements

The OSE collects data related to other Part B SPP/APR requirements from additional sources within its general supervision system, including:

1. Dispute resolution systems (complaints, mediations, due process hearings);
2. Fiscal audits and CEIS/CCEIS documentation; and
3. State-level reviews of results indicators and related requirements.

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager, in collaboration with the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting and EDFacts Coordinators, ensures that all findings—whether indicator-specific or results-based—are captured, reviewed, and prepared for inclusion in the SPP/APR submission.

Other Findings of Noncompliance

The OSE also collects and reports other findings of noncompliance that are not directly tied to compliance indicators. These include fiscal findings, dispute resolution outcomes, and results indicator–related noncompliance. All such findings are recorded in SharePoint and verified for correction through MDE’s established general supervision and data validation process before being reported to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance

Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in the prior FFY. Under each compliance indicator, states report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, states report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the state issued related to that compliance indicator.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), collects data on findings of noncompliance through a comprehensive and integrated general supervision system. The collection process is designed to ensure that all required information is identified, verified, and documented through multiple components including monitoring, fiscal reviews, data validation, and dispute resolution activities.

Origin and Collection Process

Data related to findings of noncompliance originates from multiple coordinated sources:

1. Programmatic and Integrated Monitoring Activities: Findings are identified through cyclical, targeted, and intensive risk-based monitoring. Activities include self-assessments, desk audits, interviews, and on-site visits.
2. Data Review: OSE reviews data from the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS 2.0), the Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-Based System (MCAPS), and other state databases for patterns of potential noncompliance.
3. Fiscal Monitoring: The Bureau of Fiscal Management reviews IDEA Part B funding, expenditure reports, and applications in MCAPS to ensure funds are used for allowable activities.
4. Dispute Resolution: Findings may also arise from formal state complaints, mediations, and due process hearing decisions, tracked and managed within SharePoint and the Access dispute-resolution database.

All identified noncompliance—whether indicator-specific or related to general supervision activities—is documented in MDE’s secure SharePoint system, where findings are logged, monitored, and tracked through correction and closeout.

Personnel Responsible for Data Collection

1. Executive Director, Office of Special Education: Provides overall leadership and approves findings for public reporting and federal submission.
2. Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager: Oversees the collection and verification of indicators and monitoring data; coordinates with fiscal and dispute-resolution divisions.
3. 618 Coordinator and 618 Specialist: Manage IDEA 618 data reporting and ensure consistency between compliance data and EDFacts reporting.
4. Data and Reporting Data Specialists: Conduct file reviews, collect documentation from LEAs, and perform quality checks on submissions.
5. Director of Policy and Practice: Reviews findings for compliance with IDEA and state policy; ensures that required corrective actions address root causes.
6. Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support and Parent Engagement Specialist: Collect and verify documentation from dispute-resolution cases (complaints, mediations, and due process hearings).

7. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting, Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS): Pulls data from backend systems; maintains data integrity and alignment across MSIS, SharePoint, and EDFacts.
8. Directors of Fiscal Management and Fiscal Monitoring: Collect fiscal compliance data through MCAPS submissions and audits; ensure corrective actions are completed.

Collection of Indicator-Specific Noncompliance

Each monitoring cohort (cyclical, targeted, or intensive) generates indicator-specific findings based on file reviews, interviews, and data validation. Findings are recorded in SharePoint with documentation of required corrective actions. The OSE Data and Reporting Team ensures all findings are cross-checked with MSIS 2.0 and EDFacts data prior to verification.

Collection of Findings for Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements

For noncompliance associated with related SPP/APR requirements, the OSE collects information through:

1. Desk audits and data-quality reviews of LEA submissions;
2. Fiscal audits and CEIS/CCEIS documentation reviews; and
3. Dispute-resolution outcomes as documented through state complaints and hearing decisions.

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager consolidates these findings for annual federal reporting and submission through the SPP/APR tool.

In addition to indicator-specific findings, MDE collects data on other noncompliance identified through fiscal reviews, results indicators, and systemic dispute-resolution outcomes. These findings are maintained in SharePoint, assigned for correction and verification, and reported annually in the state's General Supervision System and SPP/APR.

Data Validation

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), maintains a comprehensive, multi-level data validation process to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of all special education data reported under IDEA Part B. This process includes systematic data cleaning, cross-agency verification, and documentation review at both the state and local levels.

Data Cleaning and Quality Assurance Processes

All data are reviewed and validated through a combination of automated and manual processes:

1. Automated System Checks:



- a. Data entered into the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS 2.0) and the Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-Based System (MCAPS) undergo built-in edit and validation checks that identify missing, incomplete, or inconsistent entries. Errors are flagged for correction before data are accepted by the system.
- b. State-Level Review:
 - i. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager, with support from the 618 Coordinator, 618 Specialist, and Data and Reporting Data Specialists, conducts quality reviews after each collection cycle. This includes comparing datasets across systems (MSIS, SharePoint, EdPass, and EDFacts) to verify internal consistency and alignment with federal file specifications.
- c. Manual Verification:
 - i. Prior to submission to the U.S. Department of Education, the Director of Data Analysis and Reporting in the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) and the EDFacts Coordinators review data integrity, run audit queries to identify duplicate records, and confirm that totals reconcile with statewide aggregates. LEA Roles in Data Validation

Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) are responsible for submitting complete, accurate, and timely data. Each LEA is required to:

1. Review and verify special education data reports in MSIS 2.0 before certification;
2. Ensure that student demographic and program data are correct, including disability category, placement, and exit codes; and
3. Resolve all validation errors flagged by the system or reported by MDE prior to data certification deadlines.

LEAs must also validate findings from monitoring activities, fiscal reviews, and dispute resolution by confirming that corrective action documentation is accurate, complete, and uploaded to MDE OSE SharePoint.

Roles and Responsibilities for Validating Findings

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager oversees the verification of all findings of noncompliance, ensuring that evidence of correction is accurate and that duplicate findings are not created.

1. Data and Reporting Data Specialists validate supporting documentation for each finding and confirm that the issue has been corrected within one year of identification.
2. Director of Policy and Practice reviews validation results to ensure that corrections address both the student-level and systemic root causes of noncompliance.

3. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (OTSS) ensures technical validation of findings in databases, preventing duplication across monitoring and dispute resolution systems.

Duplicate Findings Prevention

MDE OSE uses a centralized SharePoint system and unique case identifiers to track all findings of noncompliance. Each finding is logged once, assigned to a specific monitoring activity, and linked to the appropriate LEA and indicator. Automated cross-checks and manual reviews by the Part B Data Manager and Data Specialists ensure that individual findings are not duplicated across programmatic, fiscal, and dispute resolution records.

This multi-tiered validation and verification process ensures that all reported data are high-quality, accurate, and fully compliant with federal IDEA requirements.

Data Analysis

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), employs a structured, multi-level data analysis process to ensure that all IDEA Part B data are valid, reliable, and used to identify trends, patterns of noncompliance, and opportunities for improvement across the state.

Statewide and Local Data Review

Data analysis begins with a comprehensive year-to-year review of each indicator within the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager, with support from the 618 Coordinator, 618 Specialist, and Data and Reporting Data Specialists, conducts comparative analyses across multiple years and data sources, including the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS 2.0), EdPass, SharePoint, and EDFacts submissions.

These analyses examine:

1. Statewide patterns of noncompliance, including recurring issues by indicator or region;
2. LEA-level trends, such as repeated findings in the same program area or data element;
3. Discrepancies between local and state-level reporting; and
4. Year-over-year progress toward meeting established performance and compliance targets.

The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting within the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) supports this process by running longitudinal reports and statewide data integrity checks. These analyses identify potential systemic issues, such as data-entry inconsistencies, incorrect coding, or misinterpretation of IDEA requirements.

Determining Whether Targets Are Met

Each indicator's performance is compared to its established SPP/APR target to determine whether the target was met, not met, or demonstrated slippage (a decline in performance from the previous year). The Part B Data Manager prepares summary tables and visual dashboards illustrating multi-year progress, percentage changes, and subgroup performance (e.g., by race/ethnicity, disability category, and gender).

These results are presented to OSE leadership, including the Executive Director, Director of Policy and Practice, and Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support, to discuss statewide performance and determine where technical assistance, policy updates, or corrective actions are needed.

Reviewing and Responding to Slippage

When slippage is identified, the OSE reviews the root causes by analyzing related data elements (e.g., staffing patterns, fiscal allocations, or dispute-resolution trends). The Data and Reporting Data Specialists collaborate with monitoring, fiscal, and parent engagement teams to determine whether the slippage reflects data-quality issues or programmatic challenges. Based on this analysis, OSE may:

1. Provide targeted technical assistance (TTA) to LEAs;
2. Implement additional data validation and monitoring reviews; or
3. Adjust improvement strategies under the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Documentation and Use of Results

Findings from data analyses are documented in SharePoint and used to inform:

1. The development of the annual SPP/APR narrative;
2. Annual LEA determinations, including risk assessment and performance categories; and
3. The design of statewide professional development and technical assistance initiatives.

This integrated, cross-office process ensures that MDE OSE maintains continuous oversight of IDEA implementation, promotes improvement across all indicators, and ensures data-driven decision-making to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance from Prior FFY

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), uses a coordinated verification process to ensure that all identified noncompliance—both child-specific and systemic—is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from the date of written notification. This process is implemented through the state’s general supervision system and supported by integrated databases, documentation reviews, and cross-office collaboration.

Databases, Sources, and Personnel Responsible

The MDE OSE relies on multiple data systems and sources to track, verify, and document correction of noncompliance:

1. SharePoint General Supervision Database: Serves as the centralized tracking system for all findings, evidence of correction, and closeout documentation. Each finding is assigned a unique identifier and linked to the associated LEA, indicator, and monitoring activity.
2. Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS 2.0): Used to validate correction of child-specific findings through student-level record reviews (e.g., for Indicators 11–13).
3. Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-Based System (MCAPS): Tracks fiscal corrections and verification of allowable expenditures for IDEA Part B subgrants.
4. Access Dispute Resolution Database: Records findings and verification data related to state complaints, mediations, and due process hearings.
5. EdPass/EDFacts Data Warehouse: Used to confirm systemic corrections at the state level and ensure consistency with federal submissions.

Personnel responsible for verification include:

1. Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager: Oversees the verification process, monitors timelines, and coordinates documentation between offices.
2. 618 Coordinator and 618 Specialist: Validate data consistency across systems and ensure findings are accurately reflected in the annual SPP/APR submission.
3. Data and Reporting Data Specialists: Conduct file reviews, confirm child-specific corrections, and verify documentation uploaded by LEAs.
4. Director of Policy and Practice: Reviews corrective actions to ensure changes align with IDEA regulatory requirements and state policy.
5. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (OTSS): Provides backend validation reports and ensures findings are not duplicated across data systems.
6. Director of Fiscal Monitoring: Verifies fiscal corrections and ensures all repayments or budget revisions are properly documented.

Verification of Correction – Child-Specific and Systemic Noncompliance

The verification process includes two levels of correction:

1. Child-Specific Correction:
 - a. For findings involving individual students (e.g., late evaluations, delayed transitions, or IEP implementation issues), the OSE verifies that:
 - b. The LEA has corrected the noncompliance for each affected student (e.g., completed the evaluation, held the IEP meeting, or implemented the service); and
 - c. The documentation confirming correction (e.g., revised IEP, evaluation report, or service log) is uploaded to SharePoint and validated by the assigned Data Specialist.
2. Systemic Correction:
 - a. For findings related to policies, procedures, or practices (e.g., incorrect eligibility determination processes or procedural safeguard implementation), the OSE verifies that:
 - b. The LEA has revised local policies or procedures to align with IDEA requirements;
 - c. Staff have received appropriate technical assistance or professional development; and
 - d. Subsequent data submissions (e.g., next monitoring cycle, child find, or evaluation timelines) demonstrate 100% compliance for the specific regulatory requirement.

Verification of systemic correction is confirmed through a review of updated data and follow-up file reviews conducted within one year of the initial finding.

Criteria for Determining Correction

A finding is considered corrected when the following criteria are met:

1. The LEA has demonstrated correction for each affected student (child-specific correction).
2. The LEA has demonstrated correct implementation of the requirement for a representative sample of new cases (systemic correction).
3. Evidence is reviewed, verified, and approved in SharePoint by the Part B Data Manager and Director of Policy and Practice.
4. The Executive Director, Office of Special Education, issues a written closeout letter confirming that all corrections have been verified and finalized.

Tracking Timelines for Correction

Timelines for correction are tracked in SharePoint from the date of the official written notification of noncompliance.

1. Each finding includes an assigned due date (no later than one year).
2. The Part B Data Manager monitors progress monthly and sends automated reminders to LEAs.
3. The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (OTSS) runs quarterly cross-check reports to ensure that findings have not exceeded the correction window.

Avoiding Duplicate Findings

To prevent duplication, MDE OSE uses unique identifiers and automated cross-system queries. Before a new finding is entered, the Data and Reporting Team checks the existing SharePoint database to ensure the same issue is not already open for the same district, indicator, or timeframe. The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (OTSS) performs annual deduplication audits to reconcile entries across the monitoring, fiscal, and dispute-resolution systems.

Identifying Patterns and Monitoring Sustainability

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting and 618 Coordinator analyzes statewide and LEA-level data to identify recurring areas of noncompliance (e.g., repeated issues in timely evaluations or IEP implementation).

Findings that reoccur within two consecutive cycles are flagged as systemic, triggering targeted monitoring or technical assistance. The OSE Monitoring and Support Teams continue to track LEAs for at least one additional reporting cycle to confirm the sustainability of correction.

Pre-Finding and Corrective Action Planning

MDE OSE implements a pre-finding process when potential noncompliance is identified through desk audits or data reviews but has not yet been confirmed through file review. LEAs are notified and given the opportunity to verify or correct the issue within a specified timeframe before a formal finding is issued. If unresolved, the finding is formalized and tracked through the standard correction process.

This systematic approach ensures that all findings of noncompliance are corrected promptly, verified with documented evidence, and monitored for sustained compliance,

fulfilling federal requirements under 34 CFR § 300.600–300.602 and OSEP’s general supervision expectations.

Response to OSEP-Required Actions from Previous FFY

OSEP releases required actions within the finalized SPP/APR along with the OSEP determinations. Indicate who reviews the required actions from the previous SPP/APR and how assigned SEA staff make the plan to address concerns and create a response.

When the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) issues the finalized State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and corresponding OSEP determinations, any required actions are reviewed, assigned, and tracked through an established internal process within the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE).

Review of Required Actions

Upon receipt of OSEP’s finalized determination and required actions, the Executive Director, Office of Special Education, and the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data

Manager review all OSEP comments, required actions, and feedback from the prior federal fiscal year’s SPP/APR submission.

The Part B Data Manager coordinates a meeting with key OSE and supporting offices to review the required actions, clarify OSEP feedback, and identify the data indicators or reporting components impacted. Participants typically include:

1. 618 Coordinator and 618 Specialist (for data consistency and cross-year reporting corrections);
2. Data and Reporting Data Specialists (for indicator data verification and documentation updates);
3. Director of Policy and Practice (for IDEA compliance and policy review);
4. Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support (for stakeholder engagement and dispute-resolution implications); and
5. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting within the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) (for system-level data validation and EDFacts coordination).

Developing the Response and Action Plan

The Part B Data Manager, in consultation with OSE leadership, develops a Corrective Action and Response Plan that outlines the specific steps required to address each OSEP-identified concern. This plan includes:

1. Root-cause analysis of the identified issue (e.g., data discrepancies, incomplete documentation, or process clarification);
2. Assignment of responsibility to appropriate program or data staff;
3. Timeline for correction or improvement implementation; and
4. Documentation requirements to demonstrate correction and sustainability of compliance.

All required actions and supporting documentation are tracked in the OSE SharePoint General Supervision Database, ensuring transparency, accountability, and timely follow-up.

Internal Review and Approval

Before submission to OSEP, the draft responses and action plan are reviewed by the Executive Director and the Director of Policy and Practice to ensure that all corrective measures address the specific OSEP feedback. Once approved internally, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager submits the finalized responses through the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) during the clarification period or as part of the subsequent SPP/APR submission.

Monitoring Implementation

The OSE Data and Reporting Team monitors progress toward completion of required actions and reports status updates during OSE leadership meetings. If systemic changes are needed, the Part B Data Manager collaborates with OTSS to update data validation procedures, user guidance, or documentation templates to prevent recurrence.

This structured process ensures that all OSEP-required actions are addressed promptly, documented thoroughly, and used to strengthen Mississippi's overall IDEA general supervision and data quality systems.

Internal Approval Process

Describe any internal approval processes (e.g., who must sign off, timelines).

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), follows a formal internal approval process to ensure all data, analyses, and narratives included in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are accurate, complete, and compliant with federal reporting requirements.

Review and Sign-Off Procedures

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager coordinates the annual SPP/APR development process and ensures that each indicator's

data, narrative, and required documentation are reviewed and approved through multiple levels before certification.

The following internal review and approval sequence is observed:

1. Data Validation and Review:
 - a. Indicator data are validated and verified by the 618 Coordinator, 618 Specialist, and Data and Reporting Data Specialists for accuracy and consistency with EDFacts and state datasets (MSIS, EdPass, SharePoint).
 - b. The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (Office of Technology and Strategic Services – OTSS) and EDFacts Coordinators conduct technical reviews to ensure all files meet formatting and metadata standards.
2. Programmatic and Compliance Review:
 - a. The Director of Policy and Practice reviews the narrative and data interpretation to ensure compliance with IDEA regulations and OSEP reporting expectations.
 - b. The Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support reviews sections related to dispute resolution, parent involvement, and procedural safeguards.
3. Leadership Approval:
 - a. The Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager compiles all reviewed indicator submissions and presents the full draft SPP/APR for review by the Executive Director, Office of Special Education.
 - b. The Executive Director provides final approval, certifying that all components are accurate, complete, and aligned with state and federal requirements.

Timelines

The internal approval process typically follows this annual timeline:

1. November–December: Internal review of all indicator data and narratives; completion of draft SPP/APR.
2. January: Final review and approval by OSE leadership; corrections made based on internal feedback.
3. By February 1: The Executive Director, Office of Special Education, certifies and submits the finalized SPP/APR through the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Post-Submission Clarification

If OSEP issues clarification requests, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager coordinates with indicator leads, OTSS, and program

directors to Executive prepare responses. The Director reviews and approves all clarification responses before final submission.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE), submits all State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) data and narratives through the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)—the U.S. Department of Education’s online SPP/APR submission tool.

Data Entry and Review

After internal approval, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager enters the verified data, supporting documentation, and narratives for each indicator into EMAPS. The 618 Coordinator, 618 Specialist, and Data and Reporting Data Specialists assist in reviewing data tables and ensuring consistency with EDFacts submissions and state databases, including MSIS 2.0, EdPass, and SharePoint.

The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting and EDFacts Coordinators within the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) conduct a final cross-system validation to confirm that the figures reported in EMAPS align with those in EDFacts files and other state data repositories.

Final Review and Certification

Once all indicator data and narratives have been entered and verified, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager compiles the full SPP/APR for final review by the Executive Director, Office of Special Education. The Executive Director ensures that the submission meets all federal reporting requirements and accurately reflects the state’s performance data.

The Executive Director, Office of Special Education, serves as the authorized certifying official for the State of Mississippi’s Part B SPP/APR and is responsible for certifying and submitting the final report to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), through EMAPS by February 1 of each year.

Post-Submission and Clarification

Following submission, OSEP reviews the SPP/APR and may issue clarification requests. The Part B Data Manager coordinates responses in collaboration with the 618 Coordinator, Director of Policy and Practice, and OTSS data staff. All clarification

responses are reviewed and approved by the Executive Director prior to resubmission in EMAPS.

Clarification Period

OSEP generally sends clarification requests to SEAs about 60 days post-submission. Describe how the SEA responds to specific requests for clarification concerning specific noncompliance.

Approximately 60 days after submission of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) provides clarification requests to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). These requests identify items that require additional information, verification, or revision before OSEP finalizes the state's submission and issues its annual determination.

Receipt and Initial Review

Clarification requests are sent to the Executive Director, Office of Special Education, who notifies the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting/Part B Data Manager to coordinate the agency's response. The Part B Data Manager reviews OSEP's clarification memo to identify the indicators, data elements, or narratives requiring revision.

Assignment and Preparation of Responses

The Part B Data Manager leads the clarification process and assigns specific sections of the response to the appropriate staff based on expertise and data ownership:

1. 618 Coordinator and 618 Specialist – Verify data tables, confirm calculations, and ensure alignment with EDFacts data files.
2. Data and Reporting Data Specialists – Review and update documentation for data validation, findings of noncompliance, and correction evidence.
3. Director of Policy and Practice – Reviews any clarifications related to compliance findings, corrective actions, or interpretations of IDEA regulations.
4. Director of the Office of Parent Engagement and Support – Provides input on clarifications related to dispute resolution or parent involvement data.
5. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting (Office of Technology and Strategic Services – OTSS) – Validates technical data corrections and ensures updated files are reflected in the state's data systems.

All assigned staff document updates and attach evidence of correction, validation reports, or revised data tables to the OSE SharePoint Clarification Tracker, which serves as the internal repository for all clarification correspondence and supporting materials.

Addressing Clarifications Related to Noncompliance

For clarification requests concerning findings of noncompliance, the Part B Data Manager works directly with the Data and Reporting Data Specialists to review the associated finding in SharePoint.

1. The team verifies that evidence of correction has been uploaded, confirming both child-specific and systemic correction.
2. The Director of Policy and Practice reviews the evidence to ensure that the LEA achieved 100% compliance for the applicable regulation and that documentation demonstrates sustained correction.
3. Updated summaries and correction logs are prepared for upload into the EMAPS SPP/APR tool.

Final Review and Submission

Once all responses are drafted, the Part B Data Manager consolidates them into the state's official Clarification Response Document. The Executive Director reviews and approves the final submission before it is uploaded in EMAPS. The entire clarification process is typically completed within OSEP's designated two- to three-week window following issuance of the clarification memo.

This structured process ensures that all OSEP requests are addressed accurately, with verified data and documentation, and that all corrections are fully aligned with IDEA Part B reporting and compliance requirements.