



Protocol - Indicator 7 Preschool Protocol

Indicator Description:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories A, B, and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed}) \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 1:

Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d)}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d)})] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2:



The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

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:

- There was a series of virtual meetings with parents and for the general public to review data and set targets. Special education directors are also included.
- There are 12 parents of a child with a disability and 4 parent members of organizations out of 27 members on the panel that engage in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement activities, and evaluating progress.
- 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 engagement
- 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:
 - Purpose for the Special Education Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - Knowing and Understanding the Panel By-laws
 - IDEA Regulations Regarding the Advisory Panel
 - The Panel in the Context of the History of Special Education
 - The Relationships Between Part C of IDEA, Section 619, and Part B of IDEA
 - Required Membership of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - Working as an Advisory Panel
 - Duties of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - Panel Meeting Procedures
 - The Panel and OSEP Related Items – General Supervision/APR and DMS
 - Establishing Annual Advisory Panel Priorities
 - Current Issues in Special Education and their Possible Impact on the Advisory Panel
- 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.



- 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.
- Meetings are held on weekends, evenings and at lunch to maximize the availability of people. These were held from November through January.
- Meets at least four times per year.
 - Solicits nominations for membership from interested parties, including parents.
 - These meetings serve as the primary mechanism for gathering input on target setting, data analysis, and strategy development. The timeline is aligned with the administrative year (July 1 – June 30).
- An annual report of SEAP activities and suggestions to the SEA, which must be made publicly available.
- Results of meetings, target setting, 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:

The state presents historical data and creates recommendations for targets. This is presented to stakeholders to gather feedback during the meeting. Notes are taken to review and finalize targets.

Online SPP/APR Submission Tool Information:

The SPP/APR Tool is accessible to designated staff members, including the Executive Director, Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting, Part B Data Manager, and OSE Data Specialist.

The Executive Director authorizes who receives system access, while the Data Specialist manages account permissions and coordinates communication with Partner Support regarding user access and technical issues.

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

Data Stewards:

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



- Transition Coordinators, Office of Special Education, collect and validate postsecondary outcomes data (Indicator 14); provide technical assistance to LEAs on transition requirements; ensure accuracy of transition-related data in MSIS 2.0 and SharePoint.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- ED Facts Coordinators, Office of Technology and Strategic Services, maintain ED Facts file specifications, formatting, and submission requirements; ensure alignment of all data files with federal reporting standards.

Data Source Description:

Ratings are entered by districts into MSIS 2.0 via nightly API or file upload.

IEP committee determines ratings and reports to district level individual responsible for the COS, Child Outcome Summary (Component of OCS)

COS includes a rating scale form for each a, b, and c for each child

MS uses the 7 point rating scale.

Not all MS districts have preschool programs

State Collection and Submission Schedule:

- Training are available on state website and a yearly review trainings are available
- Districts enter ratings between July 1- June 30th
- Data is to be entered within 30 days of collection (according to procedure manual)
- OTSS runs a query from MSIS 2.0 early January , calculation for each area (a, b, c) are formulated for growth for each individual child, then disaggregated for input into APR.

Collection:

- This is not a sample data collection
- Data are entered into MSIS 2.0 by LEAs
- The data is aggregated into the summary statements and available via a report in MSIS 2.0
- OTSS Developer enters the data into the APR

Data Validation:



- The Director of Data Analysis and Reporting reviews the query data to determine any significant changes from year to year.
- The Part B Data Manager and 619 Coordinator reviews and verify the COS data after it has been entered in EMAPS by OTSS. Once this verification has been made, the State Director of Special Education signs off on the entire SPP/APR submission which includes Indicator 7 data.

Data Analysis:

- The Part B Data Manager analyzes the data and develops the narrative for the APR.
- The Part B Data Manager reaches out to 619 Coordinator to discuss the date, including possible reasons for slippage and any program changes that impact the data.

Response to OSEP-Required Actions:

The Education Program Administrator for Data and Compliance reviews all required actions and feedback provided by OSEP. The Director of Special Education and the Education Program Administrator meet to discuss the feedback, identify necessary revisions, and determine appropriate corrective actions. Agreed-upon changes are then reviewed, approved, and implemented as part of the state's continuous improvement process.

Internal Approval Process:

Preliminary data and analysis are reviewed by the Data Team, the Education Program Administrator for Data and Reporting, and the Part B Data Manager. Final certification of the SPP/APR submission rests with the Executive Director of OSE.

Submission:

OTSS staff enters the data into the online SPP/APR submission tool. The State Director is authorized to certify the final report.

Clarification: Describe the process the SEA uses to prepare a response to OSEP's request for clarification.

- The Part B Data Manager reviews the request and comments for clarification and addresses the response.
- The Part B Data Manager creates a chart with each response and provides it to Executive Director and Program Area expert to review before entering those responses 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:



The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) publicly reports both the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) results and the performance of each Local Education Agency (LEA) against state-established targets in accordance with IDEA Section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 34 C.F.R. §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A).

Following OSEP's annual determination and state review process, the Office of Special Education (OSE) compiles the final SPP/APR submission, which includes statewide indicator data, trend analyses, and improvement activities. These reports are formatted as PDF documents and web-based summaries for public accessibility and transparency. For each LEA, performance data are compared to the state targets for every applicable indicator. The LEA-level performance reports are prepared by the OSE Data and Reporting Team in coordination with the Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS). After review and approval by the Director of Special Education, these reports are posted publicly on the MDE website, typically in April or May of each year.

The public reporting includes:

- The State SPP/APR report (full submission to OSEP);
- The LEA Determination Reports, which summarize district performance against each indicator target; and
- Supporting documentation outlining how results are calculated and used for improvement planning.

All SPP/APR and LEA performance reports are published at:

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

The reports remain publicly accessible year-round and archived for prior years to ensure transparency, accountability, and stakeholder engagement.