



Mississippi Department of Education

"A Quality Education for Every Child... Every Child a Reader."

State Performance Plan

2005 – 2012
Updated 02/15/2013

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders, particularly through the State Special Education Advisory Panel. The State Special Education Advisory Panel, consists of 26 members representing parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, IHL representatives, state and local officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter school, and a representative of a vocational community or business organization concerned with transition services to children with disabilities. The advisory committee members are appointed by the State Superintendent of Education and they serve in an advisory capacity to the MDE/OSE concerning: unmet needs within the State in the education of students with disabilities (SWD), the development of evaluations and reporting of data, the development of corrective action plans, and the development and implementation of policies and procedures.

The Mississippi SPP will be disseminated to the public through the constituencies of various stakeholder groups. It will be posted on the MDE website for review and downloading.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Youths in Mississippi must meet the following requirements for graduation with a standard high school diploma: a) earn a minimum of 20 Carnegie Units (Note: students entering ninth grade in school year 2005-2006 and thereafter will be required to earn a minimum of 21 Carnegie Units); b) take the following required, subject area courses - U.S. History from 1877, English II, Biology I, and Algebra I; and pass all end-of-course tests in the required subject areas noted in (b).

The graduation requirements in Mississippi associated with graduating with a standard high school diploma are the same for SWD as they are for non-disabled only (NDO).

The State obtained approval from the U.S. Department of Education to report a new 4 year cohort graduation rate in the SY 2009-2010 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). This was the first year in which data for SWD was able to be disaggregated and reported in the CSPR. As a result, new baselines and targets have been set for Indicator 1 for FFY 2009.

Data for Indicator 1 lags a year and is based on SY 2008-2009 exiting data. The data, calculations, and timelines reported here are the same as those reported under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Mississippi has implemented a 4 year cohort calculation for graduation. More information about the calculation method can be obtained from the State's Dropout Prevention Office at this link: <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/dropout-prevention-and-compulsory-school-attendance/dropout-graduation-rate-information>

To calculate the graduation rate for SWD, first the total number of SWD in the full cohort is identified. For SY 2008-2009, this would begin with first-time 9th graders in SY 2005-2006. The total number of SWD for the cohort is 5,021.

The denominator used for graduation calculations removes certain students from the full cohort. These students include students who have transferred or died. The total number of SWD in the denominator is 3,837.

The number of SWD who graduated with a regular diploma in 4 years is 740.

Therefore, the baseline data for FFY 2009 (based on SY 2008-2009 data) is:

$$740/3837 = 19\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The 19% graduation rate for SWD in Mississippi is below the national average of 48% (25th Annual Report to Congress).

The State is moving in a positive direction as indicated by the fact that the State had the largest percentage increase in graduation rate among all states according to the 25th Annual Report to Congress. In 1996-97, the graduation rate for SWD in Mississippi was 10%.

It is important to note that the cohort calculation does not include any students that were not removed in the denominator that received a regular diploma in an extended timeframe (5 or 6 years from the beginning of the cohort period). Many SWD are able to obtain a regular high school diploma in that extended period of time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline 618 data for SWD graduating with a regular diploma was 21.87% - increase graduation of SWD with a regular diploma each year by 0.5 for the first four years (2008 increase by 1.0, 2009 increase by 1.5, and 2010 increase by 2.0).
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase graduation of SWD with a regular diploma by 0.5 from 21.87% to 22.37%.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase graduation of SWD with a regular diploma by 0.5 from 22.37% to 22.87%.
2008 (2008-2009)	Increase graduation of SWD with a regular diploma by 0.5 from 22.87% to 23.37%.

<p>2009 (2009-2010) based on SY 2008-2009 data</p>	<p>Baseline ESEA data for SWD graduating with a regular diploma was 19% - Target set under Title I of the ESEA is 63%.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011) based on SY 2009-2010 data</p>	<p>66%</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012) based on SY 2010-2011 data</p>	<p>66%</p>
<p>2012 (2011-2012) based on SY 2011-2012 data</p>	<p>71%</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Youths in Mississippi must meet the following requirements for graduation with a standard high school diploma: a) earn a minimum of 21 Carnegie Units, b) take the following required, subject area courses - U.S. History from 1877, English II, Biology I, and Algebra I; and pass all end-of-course tests in the required subject areas noted in (b). The Local Education Authority (LEA) has the authority to require additional Carnegie Units to meet local requirements for a standard high school diploma. Some local LEAs who utilize a 4 x 4 block schedule require students to earn 26 – 28 Carnegie Units in order to receive a standard high school diploma.

The graduation requirements in Mississippi associated with graduating with a standard high school diploma are the same for SWD as they are for NDO. The Mississippi State Board of Education (SBE) has made a commitment to address its dropout rate for all students. This commitment has the full support of the State Superintendent of Education and the MDE.

The State Dropout Prevention Plan includes the following goal: “To increase the graduation rate for 9-12 cohort classes on a systematic basis to 85% by the 2018-2019 school year as mandated by Mississippi Code §37-13-80.”

In addition, the SBE has established five strategies to reach the goal. The five strategies are:

- Increase the rigor of the curriculum and assessment system
- Increase the quantity and quality of teachers
- Increase the quantity and quality of school leaders
- Create a culture in Mississippi that understands the value of education
- Redesign education for the 21st Century workforce in Mississippi

It is the State's goal to ensure that all students are prepared academically as well as equipped with learning and thinking skills, global awareness, information and communications technology literacy, and life skills. To address the dropout rate in Mississippi, as well as other alarming trends emerging in educational outcomes, a research-based plan to meet these challenges was developed. Redesigning Education for the 21st Century Workforce: A Plan for Mississippi addresses the challenges and demonstrates MDE's commitment to work collaboratively with LEAs, business and industry, postsecondary and institutions of higher learning, and the statewide workforce development system.

Three additional accomplishments that demonstrate Mississippi's commitment to address dropout prevention include:

- The Mississippi State Legislature established the Office of Dropout Prevention (Mississippi Code: Title 37 Education § 37-13-80) which is responsible for the administration of Mississippi's statewide dropout prevention program and the recommendation of any regulations or policies that may be adopted by the State Board of Education pertaining to dropout prevention. Additionally, it is the intent of the State that, through the statewide dropout prevention program and the dropout prevention programs implemented by each school district, the graduation rate for 9 - 12 cohort classes will be increased to eighty-five percent by the 2018-2019 school year. The Office of Dropout Prevention has established graduation rate benchmarks for each two-year period from the 2008-2009 school year through the 2018 – 2019 school year. By 2012 – 2013, initiatives instituted by the Office of Dropout Prevention are expected to reduce the State's grades 9 – 12 dropout rate by 50%. Similarly, by 2012 – 2013, the statewide truancy rate is expected to be reduced by 50% due to the programs being implemented by the Office of Dropout Prevention. Information on the State's dropout prevention plans can be found at the Office of Dropout Prevention's web page <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/dropout-prevention-and-compulsory-school-attendance/state-dropout-prevention-plan>. To assist in the accomplishment of these goals, the Office of Dropout Prevention also includes the Office of Compulsory School Attendance Enforcement, School Counseling, and Alternative Education.
- Hosting the first Destination Graduation: Teen Summit, the MDE's statewide dropout prevention awareness campaign on January 15, 2008.

- Hosting the first Destination Graduation: Adult Summit, scheduled for February 28, 2008.

All three of these accomplishments have been completed and implemented.

The OSE will continue to support the SBE goals and strategies to address Mississippi's dropout rate for all students. This statewide initiative focuses on all students and, as a result, will address Indicator 1 as OSE works to increase the percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

MDE, with consensus from stakeholder groups, addresses Indicator I through the implementation of inclusive practices and other activities relative to Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). By increasing access to the general curriculum across all grade levels and providing appropriate accommodations and modifications, more SWD are expected to meet the requirements for a standard high school diploma, thus increasing the graduation rate. With inclusive practices and the supports necessary for successful inclusion of SWD in regular education classrooms, the gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers should close.

The OSE advances its LRE goals through the following activities:

- MDE will provide resources for educational personnel in the State through information on our website and through the provision of resources to support the graduation initiative. The OSE, in consultation with Dr. Marilyn Friend of UNC-Greensboro, has developed an instructional toolkit, ***Toolkit for Success: Professional Development Resources***, which provides resources to support educational personnel in their role of providing instruction to SWD in general education settings. (Distribution to LEAs: February 2006)
- Three regional technical assistance centers were established by the State Education Authority (SEA) in 2005 for the purpose of providing support for districts in greatest need of improvement, as identified through focused monitoring. Six full-time professional personnel work with individual districts to assist with implementation of improvement plans and school improvement activities. (Ongoing)

Training is offered and conducted each year by the OSE. Topics include, but are not limited to: LRE Training, Inclusion, and IEP Training. Increasing the graduation rate for SWD is incorporated into many of these training opportunities.

Each LEA in the State is required to develop and maintain a Dropout Prevention Plan. SWD should be included in these plans.

Each LEA is required to submit a self-assessment based on the SPP/APR Indicators as part of their annual application process. In reporting on performance of Indicator 1, LEAs will be required to analyze the data provided by the state for post-school

outcomes. The State will utilize the Data Display Templates provided by National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) to provide districts with this data. This will provide districts with data that will allow them to identify targeted groups of their population for improvement.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Mississippi's procedures for collecting and reporting data related to dropouts and high school graduates are aligned closely with those outlined by the National Center for Education Statistics in the U.S. Department of Education. Annual dropout data are currently collected through the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) using dropout codes entered by district personnel.

Data for Indicator 2 lags a year and is based on SY 2010-2011 exiting data.

New baselines, targets, and activities were re-established in FFY 2011 to align with new measurement instructions provided by OSEP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012) [based on SY 2010-2011 data]:

Numerator: Total number of students with disabilities (SWD) (ages 14-21) who dropped out: 359

Denominator: Total number of SWD (ages 14-21) who left high school: 3,333
 $359/3333 = 10.77\%$

Denominator includes:

SWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma: 923

SWD who received a certificate: 2,019

SWD who reached maximum age: 25

SWD who dropped out: 359

SWD who died: 7

Students with IEPs that exited special education due to transferring to regular education or who moved, but are known to be continuing in education are not included in the denominator.

The definition of a dropout is the same for SWD and Non-Disabled Only (NDO) students.

A dropout is defined as an individual who:

- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year
- Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year
- Has not graduated from high school
- And does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - Transfer to another public school district, private school or State/district approved educational program
 - Temporary absence due to suspension or school-approved absence
 - Death

For purposes of reporting dropout data to OSEP through the IDEA 618 data collection, the State uses a single year of data for reporting. The LEAs report dropouts throughout the school year, and the data collection for 618 reporting takes place after the end of the school year.

The State also reports a dropout rate for SWD under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). That rate is based on a 4-year cohort of students. Though the definition of a dropout remains the same as for IDEA 618 reporting, the number of students who drop out is captured over a 4-year period. The dropout rate for SY 2010-2011 using ESEA calculations is 22%.

Mississippi is setting new baseline data for FFY 2011, based on SY 2010-2011 exiting information reported to OSEP under IDEA section 618. This data is currently submitted through the ED Facts file specification C009.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

MDE and its stakeholders have decided to keep the previous targets, which are the same targets for all students in the State.

The percentage of SWD dropping out of high school met the previously set target statewide target of 15% by nearly 5 percentage points. As evidenced by trend data below, Mississippi expects to meet the dropout targets set for all students in the State in the future.

FFY	Dropout Rate
2009-2010	10.31%
2008-2009	13.40%
2007-2008	16.82%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline 618 data for SWD dropping out of school was 13.74% The dropout rate for SWD will decrease by 0.5 from 13.74%.
2006 (2006-2007)	The dropout rate for SWD will decrease by 0.5 from 13.74% to 13.24%.
2007 (2007-2008)	The dropout rate for SWD will decrease by 0.5 from 13.24% to 12.74%.
2008 (2008-2009)	The dropout rate for SWD will decrease by 0.5 from 12.74% to 12.24%.
2009 (2009-2010) based on SY 2008-2009 data	Baseline ESEA data for SWD dropping out of school was 24% - Target set under Title I of the ESEA is 22% or less.
2010 (2010-2011) based on SY 2009-2010 data	18% or less
2011 (2011-2012) based on SY 2010-2011 data	Baseline data – 10.77%
2012 (2012-2013) based on SY 2011-2012 data	13% or less

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be continued and updated through 2012:

Mississippi's procedures for collecting and reporting data related to dropouts and high school graduates are aligned closely with those outlined by the National Center for Education Statistics in the U.S. Department of Education. Annual dropout data are currently collected through the MSIS using dropout codes entered by LEA personnel.

The definition of dropout is the same for SWD and NDO.

As outlined in Indicator 1, the SBE has made a commitment to address the dropout rate for all students. This commitment has the full support of the State Superintendent of Education and the MDE.

One of the SBE's bold goals states as follows: "Reduce the dropout rate to 13% by 2013."

Three additional accomplishments that demonstrate Mississippi's commitment to address dropout prevention include:

- The Mississippi State Legislature established the Office of Dropout Prevention (Mississippi Code: Title 37 Education § 37-13-80) which is responsible for the administration of Mississippi's statewide dropout prevention program and the recommendation of any regulations or policies that may be adopted by the State Board of Education pertaining to dropout prevention. Additionally, it is the intent of the State that, through the statewide dropout prevention program and the dropout prevention programs implemented by each school district, the graduation rate for 9 - 12 cohort classes will be increased to eighty-five percent (85%) by the 2018-2019 school year. The Office of Dropout Prevention has established graduation rate benchmarks for each two-year period from the 2008-2009 school year through the 2018 - 2019 school year. By 2012 - 2013, initiatives instituted by the Office of Dropout Prevention are expected to reduce the State's grades 9 - 12 dropout rate by 50%. Similarly, by 2012 - 2013, the statewide truancy rate is expected to be reduced by 50% due to the programs being implemented by the Office of Dropout Prevention.
- Hosting the first Destination Graduation: Teen Summit, the MDE's statewide dropout prevention awareness campaign on January 15, 2008.
- Hosting the first Destination Graduation: Adult Summit, scheduled for February 28, 2008.

All three of these accomplishments have been completed and implemented.

Mississippi Code of 1972 Annotated § 37-13-80 was responsible for the creation of the Office of Dropout Prevention in September 2006. This office is responsible for the administration of Mississippi's statewide dropout prevention program, and any regulations or policies that may be adopted by the SBE pertaining to dropout prevention.

MDE believes the work of dropout prevention is a department-wide coordinated initiative. Various offices within the MDE have programs that address dropout prevention, including the OSE, the former Office of Reading, Early Childhood and Language Arts (now under the Office of Curriculum and Instruction as of July 1, 2010), the Office of Safe and Orderly Schools, the Office of School Improvement, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, the Office of Vocational Education and Workforce Development, and the Office of Innovative Support.

The Office of Curriculum and Instruction has several programs in place that aim to help increase the graduation rate of the State of Mississippi, and create more relevancy and rigor in the overall classroom experience of more students. The Curriculum Frameworks have been revised over the last couple of years to add more rigor and relevance in the instruction of core content, and courses required for graduation. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the OSE supports State Board Policy 4300 (Three Tier Model for Intervention) that aims to provide teachers and district administrators support in identifying research-based strategies to help students academically and behaviorally. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction also support credit recovery policies that allow for students to earn credit for courses they were previously unsuccessful without having to take the full course. The programs' goals are to help increase the graduation rates that are supported by the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. The programs will create a new learning experience that meet the needs of students and by helping teachers and administrators incorporate more innovative approaches to instruction.

The Office of Compulsory School Attendance Enforcement works directly with students who are truant. Truancy is often the first sign that a student is experiencing environmental changes, which derive from school, home, or community issues. School attendance officers address the truancy component of the dropouts in Mississippi, along with other vital roles such as:

- Finding the reason for poor attendance
- Providing assistance that addresses the reason for poor attendance
- Educating families on the Mississippi Compulsory School Attendance Law
- Re-engaging students who are transitioning from youth detention centers
- Working as liaisons with schools and families to prevent a student from dropping out
- Motivating students and families about the importance of an education and attending school
- Filing charges when necessary in enforcing the law

SWD are included in the Redesign plan. The Office of Vocational & Technical Education oversees the Special Populations program, a federally-funded program which provides remediation to students in vocational and technical areas, including SWD. Special Populations' services focus on recruitment, enrollment, instruction, retention, completion, placement, and follow-up of special populations preparing for high skill, high wage occupations and/or nontraditional employment in new and emerging careers. The purpose of instructional services rendered by Special Populations personnel is to enable Special Populations students (including SWD) to experience success in their chosen vocational education programs. Student services personnel may provide instruction for the disadvantaged vocational SWD in areas including mathematics, reading, and writing. The instruction is coordinated with the vocational instructor, and services are delivered concurrently with enrollment in a vocational education program. A diverse method of instruction is used in providing services to those identified students. Students receive a variety of instruction ranging from individualized instruction, to updated computer remediation programs. This process is to ensure that those students master competencies, and learn employability skills to assist them in becoming successful in the world of work. Vocational education instructors continue to utilize the differentiated instructional strategies listed on each student's IEP to deliver instruction. The Special Populations instructor continues to be available for remediation.

The OSE will continue to support the SBE goals and strategies to address Mississippi's dropout rate for all students. This Statewide initiative focuses on all students, and will address Indicator 2 as OSE works to decrease the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

MDE, with consensus from stakeholder groups, will address Indicator 2 through the implementation of inclusive practices and other activities relative to LREs. By increasing access to the general curriculum across all grade levels and providing appropriate accommodations and modifications, more SWD are expected to meet the requirements for a standard high school diploma, thus increasing the graduation rate. With inclusive practices and the supports necessary for successful inclusion of SWD in regular education classrooms, the graduation gap between SWD and their non-disabled peers should close.

The OSE advances its LRE goals through the following activities:

- MDE will provide resources for educational personnel in the state through information on our website and through the provision of resources to support this initiative. The OSE, in consultation with Dr. Marilyn Friend of UNC-Greensboro, has developed an instructional toolkit, ***Toolkit for Success: Professional Development Resources***, which provides resources to support educational personnel in their role of providing instruction to SWD in general education settings. (Distribution to LEAs: February 2006)
 - Additional items were added to the **Toolkit for Success: Professional Development Resources** during the 2011-2012 school year. Toolkits

- containing original resources as well as the newly added resources were disseminated to LEAs. A total of 30 additional toolkits were distributed to the 152 LEAs, Regional Resource Centers (RSC), and various offices at MDE. The resources included in the toolkits are designed to provide support to educators by addressing the needs of individual students in the various content areas. The resources will increase SWD success in general education courses, and their ability to earn a standard high school diploma.
- Various resources included in the toolkit are frequently featured in regional meetings, regional trainings conducted by the OSE, and quarterly meetings scheduled with the Directors of Special Education.
 - Three regional technical assistance centers were established by the SEA for the purpose of providing support for districts in greatest need of improvement, as identified through focused monitoring. Six full-time professional personnel work with individual districts to assist with implementation of corrective action plans and school improvement activities. (Implementation: Ongoing)
 - During the 2011-2012 school year, staff assigned to the 3 RSCs continued their provision of technical assistance to LEAs that were monitored during the 2008-2009 school year. The RSC staff worked with many of these LEAs prior to the on-site visit to assist them with the LEA self-review. Following the OSE site visit, the RSC staff assisted many of these LEAs in the development of the LEA improvement plan. In all instances, the RSC staff completed their primary responsibility of supporting the LEA staff in the correction of noncompliance through the implementation of the corrective actions in the approved LEA improvement plans.

Training is offered and conducted each year by the Office of Special Education. Topics include, but are not limited to: LRE Training, Inclusion, and IEP Training. Decreasing the dropout rate for SWD is incorporated into many of these training opportunities.

- During SY 2011-2012, training opportunities were provided to LEA personnel related to LRE, Inclusion, and IEPs. Training was provided on the following dates:
 - Vicksburg, MS – July 28, 2011
 - Desoto, MS – October 26, 2012
 - Gulfport, MS – November 8, 2011
 - Jackson, MS – November 14, 2011
 - Gulfport, MS – November 29, 2011
 - Gulfport, MS – November 30, 2011
 - Starkville, MS – December 15, 2011
 - Jackson, MS – January 9, 2012
 - Jackson, MS – January 10, 2012
 - Jackson, MS – January 13, 2012

- Desoto, MS – January 23, 2012
- Desoto, MS – January 24, 2012
- Tupelo, MS – February 9, 2012
- Tupelo, MS – February 10, 2012
- Jackson, MS – February 15, 2012
- Tupelo, MS – March 1, 2012

Each LEA in the State is required to develop and maintain a Dropout Prevention Plan. SWD are included in these plans.

Each LEA is required to submit a self-assessment based on the SPP/APR Indicators as part of their annual application process. In reporting on performance of Indicator 2, LEAs will be required to analyze the data provided by the state for post-school outcomes. The State will utilize the Data Display Templates provided by National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) to provide districts with this data. This will provide districts with data that will allow them to identify targeted groups of their population for improvement.

OSE collaborates annually with Vocation and Technical Education, Curriculum and Instruction, the Office of Dropout Prevention, and Compulsory School Attendance Enforcement to host the Dropout Prevention Conference.

During the 2011-2012 school year, the Mississippi State Board of Education (SBE) updated the State's accountability standards to include a new exit option: the Career Pathways Diploma. This update also included the requirement that all students exiting 8th grade must complete an Individual Career and Academic Plan (iCAP). The Career Pathway Option is a standard diploma that requires the students to complete four career and technical education units and two-and-one-half elective units specified in the student's iCAP. The iCAP is a guide for students to help them establish and achieve their career and academic goals for success after high school by (1) providing mentorship and guidance to assist students in career pathway planning, (2) helping students identify correct graduation pathway options, (3) supporting changes to meet student needs and ambitions and (4) helping students transition into a profession or postsecondary educational major. Training was provided as follows:

- Indianola, MS – September 12, 2011; October 17, 2011
- Pearl, MS – September 14, 2011; October 13, 2011
- Pearl, MS – September 16, 2011; October 12, 2011
- MS State, MS – September 19, 2011; October 24, 2011
- Tupelo, MS - September 23, 2011; November 11, 2011
- Perkinston, MS – September 26, 2011; November 1, 2011
- MS State, MS – September 27, 2011; October 24, 2011
- Hattiesburg, MS – September 28, 2011; October 31, 2011
- Summit, MS - September 29, 2011; November 10, 2011
- Tunica, MS – October 3, 2011; November 9, 2011

School administrators at the 2011 MASA Annual Fall Meeting and Leadership Conference on October 16-18, 2011 received information about the iCAP.

In January 25, 2012, OSE provided superintendents with information on the Career Pathways and iCAP at the Mississippi Association State Superintendents (MASS) Winter Conference. Additional information was provided at the March 28, 2012 MASS Spring Conference. The superintendents were provided information about the Mississippi Occupational Diploma (MOD) and the iCAP.

OSE provides training opportunities via Listserv communication to the Directors of Special Education. This included webinars such as Building Early Warning Systems to Identify Students with Disabilities at Risk for Dropping out of High School and Monitoring Their Response to Intervention and Transition Planning: Developing a “Summary of Performance” and Setting Goals.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (A))

Overview**Measurement:**

- A. (choose either A.1 or A.2)
 - A.1 AYP percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size})] \text{ times } 100.$
 - A.2 AMO percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size})] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Participation rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs participating in an assessment}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math})]$. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math})]$. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Mississippi reports assessment results separately by grade level and subject area for each assessment. Performance data are combined across assessments, grade levels, and subject areas for accountability purposes using special proficiency indexes that statistically adjust for the technical differences. Those adjustments produce results that are equitable and can be compared across schools regardless of their grade configurations (e.g., comparing a K-3 elementary school to a 9-12 high school).

The Mississippi Statewide Assessment System (MSAS) provides procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students in the assessment programs, including a wide range of testing accommodations, instructional level testing on the MCT2, and alternate assessments. In accordance with SB Policy IIB-3 and MS Code 37-16-3(2) all eligible students are tested. The data for students using testing accommodations are treated no differently from any other test data. In accordance with the most recent U.S. Department of Education regulations regarding the assessment for students under the NCLB, the only students who should be assessed using instructional level tests and alternate assessments based on the Extended Curriculum Frameworks are students who fall under the state's definition of Significantly Cognitively Disabled (SCD). All other students should be assessed against grade level standards using the regular state assessments with any necessary allowable accommodations.

The Mississippi Department of Education submitted Mississippi's ESEA Flexibility (Waiver) Request to the United States Department of Education (ED) on February 24, 2012. MDE's Request was approved by ED on July 19, 2012 and was implemented in schools in the 2012-2013 school year. This included the reporting of 2011-2012 school year assessment results. As a result of the approved waiver, Mississippi will be resetting baselines for portions of Indicator 3 for FFY 2011.

For more information on Mississippi's ESEA Flexibility Request, please see our website: <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/federal-programs/the-esea-flexibility-waiver> .

With the new Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) model, the State has set targets for all students as well as for certain subgroups. One of those subgroups is students with disabilities. The goal for all students is to reduce by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years.

In prior years, Mississippi reported on the AYP performance of LEAs in Indicator 3A. With the approval of the ESEA Flexibility Request, AYP calculations will no longer take place in the State and will be replaced with AMO calculations. Therefore, the State will report using the 3A.2 calculation option for Indicator 3. Baselines and targets for Indicator 3A.2 have been reset to reflect this change.

In addition, proficiency targets for Indicator 3C have been aligned with the AYP proficiency calculations in the past. In order to remain aligned to the State's goals and to better reflect the subgroup-specific goals for students with disabilities set forth in the ESEA Flexibility Request, the State is also resetting baselines and targets for Indicator 3C.

Baselines and targets previously set for participation data reported under Indicator 3B will not be reset in order to maintain historical trend data.

The minimum “n” size for all subgroups is 30.

Baseline Data:

Baseline Data was reset for Indicators 3A.2 and 3C in FFY 2011 (2011-2012).

Baseline Data for Indicator 3B refers to FFY 2004 (2004-2005).

A.2 AMO percent = [(# of LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of LEAs that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

LEAs with a disability subgroup that met the State’s minimum “n” size and met the State’s AMO target for the disability subgroup.

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs Meeting the “n” size	Number of LEAs that meet the minimum “n” size and met AMO for FFY 2011	Percent of LEAs
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	152	139	24	17.3%

B. Participation rate (FFY 2004 (2004-2005))

Reading/Language

a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
N=30,658

b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations
N=12,443 (40.59%)

c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations
N=14,613 (47.66%)

d. # of children with IEPs in alternative assessment against grade level standards N=56 (0.18%)

e. # of children with IEPs in alternative assessment against alternate achievement standards N=2,761(9.01%)

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

2.56% of the population had a significant medical emergency, were absent during regular testing dates plus makeup date, or had data errors resulting in test data not matching MSIS data.

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a. (29,873 / 30,658) = 97.44%

Mathematics

a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
N=30213

b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations
N=12,220 (40.44%)

c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations
N=14,424 (47.74%)

d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards; and
N=53 (0.18%)

e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards.
N=2609 (8.64%)

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

3.00% of the population had a significant medical emergency, were absent during regular testing dates plus makeup date, or had data errors resulting in test data not matching MSIS data.

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a. (29,306 / 30,213) = 97.00%

C. Proficiency rate (FFY 2011 (2011-2012))

Statewide Assessment – 2011-2012		Math Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
A	Children with IEPs	4451	4218	4136	3868	3471	3304	2489	25937	
B	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1232	810	538	339	232	243	200	3594	44.6
C	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	526	481	450	403	444	489	551	3344	41.5
D	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
E	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
F	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	186	243	247	176	114	150		1116	13.9
G	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	1944	1534	1235	918	790	882	751	8054	31.1

Statewide Assessment – 2011-2012		Reading Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
A	Children with IEPs	4458	4223	4138	3869	3479	3313	2496	25976	
B	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	893	733	447	345	234	175	131	2958	51.2
C	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	230	279	283	248	291	182	170	1683	29.1
D	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
E	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
F	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	185	228	203	212	151	154		1133	19.6
G	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	1308	1240	933	805	676	511	301	5774	22.2

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The percentage of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size and meeting AMO for 2011-2012 is 17.3%. MDE/OSE along with its stakeholder groups looks forward to improving performance on this indicator.

MDE believes the participation rates of 97.44% in reading and 97.00% in math indicate that the State is in compliance with the requirement that all students participate in the statewide assessment system. The small percentage of students who were not assessed had a significant medical emergency, were absent, or did not have sufficient data to substantiate a match between test data and MSIS identification. The testing participation rates for NDO students were 99% for both Reading and Mathematics.

Of all SWD who were assessed, 22.20% scored proficient in reading/language. By comparison, 57% to 63% of NDO students scored proficient in reading across grade levels. In math, 31.10% scored proficient, and 61% to 78% of NDO students scored proficient in math.

Measurable and Rigorous Target:

As a result of the State’s approved ESEA Flexibility Request, baselines and targets have been reset in FFY 2011. Targets for FFY 2012 have been set in the tables below.

A.2 AMO FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
	RLA	MATH
2005 (2005-2006)	97.0 (Actual 50.0)	85.0 (Actual 46.2)
2006 (2006-2007)	97.0 (Actual 35.7)	85.0 (Actual 35.0)
2007 (2007-2008)	40.0	
2008 (2008-2009)	45.0	
2009 (2009-2010)	45.0	
2010 (2010-2011)	50.0	
2011 (2011-2012)	Baseline reset (Actual 17.3)	
2012 (2012-2013)	18.3	

B. Participation FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
	Reading/Language Participation	Mathematics Participation
2005 (2005-2006)	95.0	95.0
2006 (2006-2007)	95.0	95.0
2007 (2007-2008)	95.0	95.0
2008 (2008-2009)	95.0	95.0
2009 (2009-2010)	95.0	95.0
2010 (2010-2011)	95.0	95.0
2011 (2011-2012)	95.0	95.0
2012 (2012-2013)	95.0	95.0

C. Proficiency FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
	Reading/Language Proficiency	Mathematics Proficiency
2005 (2005-2006)	45.9	39.9
2006 (2006-2007)	45.9	39.9
2007 (2007-2008)	32.3	35.7
2008 (2008-2009)	49.3	51.7
2009 (2009-2010)	49.3	51.7
2010 (2010-2011)	66.3	68.0
2011 (2011-2012)	Baseline Reset (Actual 22.20)	Baseline Reset (Actual 31.10)
2012 (2012-2013)	45.0	50.0

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

A number of training opportunities are provided by the OSE and the OSA regarding the participation and performance of SWD in the MSAS. A manual has been developed and provided to district personnel, *Mississippi Statewide Assessment System Guidelines for Testing Students with Disabilities*. The handbook is available on the MDE website at <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/student-assessment/student-assessment-special-populations>.

Guidance is provided to school personnel, parents, and students to ensure that informed decisions are being made regarding the MSAS. The guidance is in accordance with IDEA 1997 and IDEA '04 and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act.

In accordance with MS Code 37-16-3, all eligible students enrolled in public schools participate in the MSAS. Superintendents of each LEA certify annually that all eligible students enrolled in designated grades/courses are tested.

The State's improvement activities in LRE will provide greater exposure for SWD to be taught the same curricular objectives as NDO and will provide greater opportunities for SWD to participate in grade level assessments, with the anticipated goal that performance of SWD will increase as these inclusive practices are implemented.

A Listserv is utilized to provide important communication with Directors of Special Education regarding pertinent information. Critical information regarding assessment issues is shared with Directors of Special Education via this Listserv on a routine basis. Key supervisory staff in the OSA and OSE work collaboratively to provide support and guidance to staff in an effort to keep staff informed of updates and share information. Staff from both offices work together to support the major initiatives. Both of these offices are under the same Deputy Superintendent, which facilitates support and collaboration of these two offices. OSE staff assist with the review and collection of information submitted to the OSA. Information obtained through these collaborative reviews informs staff in these two offices of areas in need of additional guidance and technical assistance to LEA personnel. Refer to Indicator 5 for LRE improvement activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE****Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MDE/OSE collects and examines data from each local school district on an annual basis to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of disciplinary actions due to violations of the district's code of conduct that result in suspensions or expulsions of children with disabilities. This information is collected among the LEAs and compared to the rates for NDO children within the local school districts.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Identification of Comparison Methodology

Mississippi uses a rate difference calculation for Indicator 4.

A “significant discrepancy” is defined as having students with disabilities (SWD) suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities (SWOD).

Mississippi uses the following comparison methodology defined in 34 CFR §300.170(a):

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

For Indicator 4a, an LEA will have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least 2 percentage points greater than its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

For Indicator 4b, an LEA will have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from a racial/ethnic group is at least 2 percentage points greater than its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

When significant discrepancy is determined for an LEA, the MDE/OSE will require the LEA to conduct a self-review of policies, procedures, and practices to determine if they contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Data on suspensions and expulsions is gathered from the State database. The data pertaining to SWD is taken from the Table 5 618 data collection, also reported to ED Facts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to NDO is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in the State database.

Mississippi uses a minimum “n” size of 10 for Indicator 4. The data for Indicator 4 lags a year behind the reporting year.

Mississippi is reporting baseline data for FFY 2010 due to using an unallowable methodology in the FFY 2009 APR.

Baseline Data for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

Baseline data was set for Indicator 4 in FFY 2010, using SY 2009-2010 data.

Indicator 4A – LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies	Percent
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	152	44	28.95%

Indicator 4B(a) - LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	152	57	37.50%

Indicator 4B(b) - LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Percent
FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data)	152	0	0.00%

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices *(completed in FFY 2010 using 2009-2010 data):*

For each LEA identified with a significant discrepancy, the State required the LEA to review its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and

implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. The LEAs submitted evidence of their review to the State.

No noncompliance was identified as a result of the review of policies, procedures, and practices for LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy in both Indicator 4a and 4b.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Statewide – 1.91% of students without disabilities and 3.25% of students with disabilities (SWD) were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days. It appears that SWD are being suspended/expelled at a higher statewide rate than students without disabilities. District-by-district calculations show that 44 districts are suspending/expelling SWD at a higher rate than that of their nondisabled peers. MDE will focus on positive behavioral supports and interventions, team problem-solving, and intensified child find efforts to address the discrepancy.

No districts were found to have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	0 school districts will suspend/expel students with disabilities at a higher rate than students without disabilities.
2006 (2006-2007)	0 school districts will suspend/expel students with disabilities at a higher rate than students without disabilities.
2007 (2007-2008)	0 school districts will suspend/expel students with disabilities at a higher rate than students without disabilities.
2008 (2008-2009)	0 school districts will suspend/expel students with disabilities at a higher rate than students without disabilities.
2009 (2009-2010) based on SY 2008-2009 data	4a - 0 school districts will suspend/expel students with disabilities at a higher rate than students without disabilities. 4b – 0%

<p>2010 (2010-2011) based on SY 2009-2010 data</p>	<p>4a – 0% 4b – 0%</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012) based on SY 2010-2011 data</p>	<p>4a – 0% 4b – 0%</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013) based on SY 2011-2012 data</p>	<p>4a – 0% 4b – 0%</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Training will be provided annually to LEAs following the annual review of data regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, use of behavioral interventions (including the conducting of the Manifestation Determination Review (MDR) and the conducting of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA).

Response to Intervention (Rtl) Procedural and Technical Manual

The MDE has developed a procedural and technical manual, *Response to Intervention, (Rtl) Procedural and Technical Manual* to provide guidance to LEAs as they implement Rtl, <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/IPS/Rtl/index.html>. Schools are encouraged to implement Rtl within broader school reform and school improvement efforts to improve the learning and achievement of all students, while meeting NCLB, IDEA 2004, and LRE requirements. The Rtl process allows for the gathering and examining of data for use in developing, analyzing, and implementing research or evidence-based interventions used with students in the context of intervening with a student who may be at risk, academically or behaviorally.

While Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) are NOT implemented for SWD, LEAs are allowed to use up to 15% of their Part B funds to provide support for NDO students determined to be in need of academic and/or behavioral intervention services. The school wide supports implemented to support NDO students address at risk behaviors, create safer, educationally conducive learning environments, and support practices that ultimately benefit all learners within a school.

Activities funded by LEAs as CEIS for NDO include:

- Professional development for teachers and other school staff for the targeted at-risk NDO students to improve the delivery of scientifically based academic instruction and behavioral interventions and,
- Educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction.

The Mississippi RtI process provides support to LEA personnel in accordance with Mississippi Code 37-11-18 (1) and 37-11-54 which requires LEAs to implement effective behavior management strategies that utilizes evidence-based practices and positive behavioral interventions supports in an effort to prevent student behavior problems as well as to effectively address presenting student problems.

State Board Policy 4300 requires all LEAs to adopt and utilize a Three Tier Instructional Model. All three tiers of Mississippi's RtI process include a behavioral component in the Essential Elements Matrix.

Tier 1 includes the Essential Elements: Universal Screening of Behavior (Essential Element #4), Classroom and Behavior Management (Essential Element #8), and System of Behavioral Support {school and district levels} (Essential Element #9).

Screening instruments for behavior that have been highlighted in Tier I trainings, include: Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD), the Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Team Implementation Checklist, and the School-wide Evaluation Toom (SET). Screening instruments are not limited to those highlighted.

Tier 1 provides training on the component of direct observation of all places on the school property that are accessible to students. It also focuses on the review and analysis of Office Disciplinary Referrals (ODR) to evaluate student behavior.

Classroom and Behavior Management

Essential Element 8 of the Tier I Matrix addresses both classroom and behavior management. Classroom management plays vital roles in overall school discipline by creating a school climate and enabling enhanced student achievement. Effective classroom management establishes a learning environment that enables academic and other activities to operate and transition smoothly.

System of Behavioral Support (School and District Levels)

Essential Element 9 of the Tier I Matrix addresses the use of a district and school-wide behavioral management support system.

Tiers 2 and 3 include the Essential Elements of Strategic/Targeted Intervention and

Supplemental Instruction Supported by Scientifically-based Research in Behavioral/Emotional Areas (Essential Element #7) and A System of Behavioral Support {School and District Levels} (Essential Element #10).

Tier 3: Focuses on intensive interventions in the areas of academics and behavior. The focus is on academic and behavioral strategies, methodologies, and practices designed for students who are having significant difficulties with the established grade level objectives in the general education curriculum or who demonstrate significant difficulties with behavioral and social competence.

Again, while the focus of Rtl is on intervening with students who have not yet been identified as a child with a disability, the benefits to SWD are increased when the focus is school-wide. Positive reform efforts achieved through the implementation of Mississippi's Rtl process affects all students, not just the NDO students. There is no way to separate the benefits to SWD when school-wide positive behavior efforts are implemented for all students.

Training has been provided to MDE staff over the 2007-2008 school year, including staff in the OSE regarding Mississippi's Rtl process. During FFY 2007 (SY 2007 – 2008), the lead role for Rtl was moved from the OSE to the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. Both offices are under one Deputy Superintendent, which facilitates support and collaboration.

Long-term Rtl strategic plans have been developed by the Rtl State team, in collaboration with Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) and SERRC.

The MDE currently maintains a list of approved consultants who are under contract with the OSE to provide training to LEAs in the areas of: Behavior and Academic Interventions and Positive Behavior Supports. These consultants are also available to provide guidance to individual LEAs at the LEA expense, if needed. Most, if not all of these consultants are approved Rtl trainers.

Resources:

Staff assigned to the Division of SPP/APR will review the data collected annually.

Staff assigned to the Division of Data Services will oversee the collection of the data.

Staff assigned to the Division of Technical Assistance will provide technical assistance in the areas noted above.

The MS SPDG will build a network of individuals with expertise in PBIS in order to provide greater behavioral supports to SWD.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Student data including student and teacher schedules are sent to the state student level database, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). Upon completion of the month 3 submission of data, a “snapshot” is taken of the student schedules. A calculation is then applied using the course codes in the student’s schedules and the minutes for the course from the teacher’s schedule. An analysis of the make-up of the class is also done to be sure that the make-up of the class is at least 50% regular education students.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day: 52.47%
- B. Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day: 22.48%
- C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 2.63%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is an area of focus in Mississippi. The percentage of children in regular education settings for 80% or more of the school day has increased from 44.10% in 2002-03 to 52.47% in 2004-05. The State is above the national average of 46%*. The percentage of SWD who are self-contained is 22.48%, compared to the national average of 20%*. Mississippi’s percentage of students at 2.63% in out-of-district placements is below the national average at 4.2%*.

* 25th According to the Annual Report to Congress (2003)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in a regular education setting will increase 1% to 53.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in a self contained setting will decrease 1% to 21.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
2006 (2006-2007)	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in a regular education setting will increase 1% to 54.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in a self contained setting will decrease 1% to 20.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
2007 (2007-2008)	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in a regular education setting will increase 1% to 55.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in a self contained setting will decrease 1% to 19.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>

<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in a regular education setting will increase 1% to 56.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in a self contained setting will decrease 1% to 18.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in regular education setting will increase 1% to 57.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in self contained settings will decrease .5% to 17.98 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in regular education setting will increase .5% to 57.97%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in self contained settings will decrease .5% to 17.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in regular education setting will increase .5% to 58.47%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in self contained settings will decrease .5% to 16.98 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>The percentage of students with disabilities in regular education setting will increase .5% to 58.97%.</p> <p>The percentage of students in self contained settings will decrease</p>

	<p>.5% to 16.48 %.</p> <p>The percentage of students in MS who are placed in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements will not increase.</p>
--	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities to address LRE are specified in the Mattie T. Implementation Plan, which is aligned with the State’s improvement plan. MDE staff responsible for data collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting complete the following activities designed to provide LEAs with the necessary data to make effective, data-driven decisions when designing their local improvement plans:

- Annually calculate and provide to each LEA district and statewide educational environment data in a Special Education LEA Data Profile [Annually in March]
- Annually calculate for each LEA the amount of variances from annual targets and provide this information in written form to LEAs [Annually in March]
- Train and assist staff of LEAs identified as most at variance to conduct data analysis of school level data [Annually in the fall]
- Analyze current LEA data, looking at change from the previous year to identify LEAs below the annual target as well as identify LEAs with the greatest change (positive or negative) from the previous year [Annually in spring]

The 2003 *Modified Mattie T. Consent Decree* requires the State to obtain the services of consultants to advise and direct implementation of improvement activities. Dr. Marilyn Friend of UNC-Greensboro is the Mattie T. consultant in the area of LRE; Dr. Alan Coulter, director of NCSEAM, is the child find consultant. Dr. Friend has participated in strategic planning and implementation of improvement strategies, provided technical assistance to the personnel statewide regarding LRE through various means including, teleconferencing, presenting at annual statewide conferences, developing materials and school-based instruments for educator use within school buildings and individual classrooms. A collection of resources, the ***Toolkit for Success: Professional Development Resources*** will be provided to LEAs. The toolkit includes print and other materials related to LRE for LEAs to utilize to improve personnel knowledge and skills in core LRE concepts, service delivery, and research-based instructional practices. The MDE has developed a state level dissemination plan to ensure all LEAs receive the identified LRE materials. These materials will be disseminated at the upcoming Leadership Institute: Building Educationally Responsive Schools, in February 2006.

The MDE has created a portal on its website to provide access to information, links, and other items related to LRE.

A protocol for LEA personnel use has been developed to guide decision making for appropriate educational placements for SWD. [Implementation February 2006]

The MDE requires that each LEA submit an annual self-assessment as part of their annual project application process addressing the LEA's review of data and compliance with regard to LRE. This self-assessment must identify how the LEA will utilize the results of the self-assessment to implement effective changes in policies, practices, and procedures. [Annually in summer]

In addition to the above activities, the MDE requires all LEAs with CAPs submitting proposals for data-based school change grants to focus their efforts on achieving Mattie T. goals (including the LRE priority). The OSE under Part B of the IDEA Fiscal Year 2005 is releasing \$2,300,000 in federal funds to be utilized in awarding grants for districts who submit successful proposals for the MS Data-Based School Change Initiative, a competitive process for LEAs to receive funding for the purpose of providing activities specifically designed to implement improvement strategies based upon practices demonstrated to be effective in achieving positive outcomes for students through research, materials, and/or technology using knowledge derived from educational research. Although graduation with a standard high school diploma is not one of the specific priority areas of the grants, LEAs may address the issue of increasing the percentage of SWD who exit school with a standard high school diploma if the district's review of their data indicated this issue was a priority need of the district. The LEA proposals must focus on improvement activities integral to addressing specific priorities, one of which is increasing the percentage of SWD participating successfully in regular education classes for 80% or more of the school day. The project requires co-coordinators from regular education and special education. Staff development is an integral part of the project and must include participant involvement in decision-making, coaching, or mentoring after initial trainings, measures of the impact of training on participants, and measure of the impact on outcomes for students. A major focus of the professional development activities is on the change in participant knowledge and skill as a result of the professional development provided its implementation in the classroom and other learning settings, and most importantly, its impact on students. LEAs submitting successful proposals are eligible for up to \$50,000. (Implementation date of 05-06 projects: August 2005; Proposals for 06-07 due February 24, 2006)

A system of focused monitoring was implemented (piloted) in 2003 with full implementation in February 2004. Staffs in the monitoring division are monitoring LRE as an indicator area for the third consecutive year as a focused monitoring priority. A staff of four MDE personnel and approximately 40 team members (consultants, parents, and practitioners) support the focused monitoring efforts for the state.

Training has been provided to team members and team leaders to provide them with the necessary information to serve in the capacity of team member or team leader. Protocols have been revised recently to incorporate necessary changes and to refine the on-site data collection process.

The MDE has established three technical assistance centers within Regional Service Centers (RSC) affiliated with state institutions of higher learning to provide technical assistance to districts on CAPs in each of the three focused monitoring areas, including LRE. Each RSC has employed technical assistance specialists whose primary responsibility is to support districts with active CAPs in the implementation of their corrective actions. [Implemented August 2005]

Resources Necessary to Support this Priority:

The following MDE/OSE personnel:

Division of Data Services (3)

Division of Technical Assistance

Division of Program Improvement Monitoring (6)

Regional TA Specialists (5)

Monitoring Consultants (2)

Mattie T. Consultants (2)

Support from the MDE Offices of Curriculum and Instruction, Reading/Early Childhood/Language Arts, Compulsory Attendance, Professional Development and Training

\$2.3 million for Data-based School Change Grant Initiative

\$175,000 for *Toolkit for Success: Professional Development Resources*

\$1,409,553 for Focused Monitoring

\$1,250,000 Professional Development and Training

\$874,069 Staff in Divisions of Technical Assistance and Monitoring

Support from the MDE Offices of Curriculum and Instruction, Reading/Early Childhood/Language Arts, Compulsory Attendance, Professional Development and Training

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Student data, including educational environment, are sent to the state student level database, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). For children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, this data is collected as part of the Child Count data collection that takes place no later than December 1 each year. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, Mississippi collected the following educational environments for children aged 3 through 5:

Type of Program	Setting	Permitted Value
Children attending a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours a week	And receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	PI – services regular early childhood program (at least 10 hours)
	And receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in some other	PJ – other location regular early childhood program (at least 10 hours)

	location	
Children attending a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours a week	And receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	PK – services regular early childhood program (less than 10 hours)
	And receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in some other location	PL – other location regular early childhood program (less than 10 hours)
Children not attending a regular early childhood program or kindergarten	Attending a special education program	PG – Separate Class
		PF – Separate School
		PE – Residential Facility
	Not attending a special education program	PC - Home
		PH – Service Provider Location

It is important to note that Mississippi does not have a statewide early childhood program.

Baseline Data from FFY 2011 (SY 2011-2012):

- A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

$$6,798 / 10,498 = 64.75\%$$

- B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

$$1,582 / 10,498 = 15.07\%$$

The numerator for 6A is comprised of students who were marked with PI and PK educational environments in MSIS. The numerator for 6B is comprised of students with educational environments coded as PG, PF, and PE.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The collection of the current educational environment values have been in place since the 2010-2011 school year. From the 2010-2011 to the 2011-2012 school year, Mississippi saw an increase in the number of 3 to 5 year olds in separate classes, separate schools, and residential facilities. Mississippi also saw a decrease in the percentage of 3 to 5 year olds receiving the majority of services in the regular early childhood program. The available trend data was limited to one year.

When compared to national 618 data, it is noted that Mississippi is performing well above the average.

Indicator	Mississippi	50 states, D.C., and P.R. (including BIE schools)
6A	64.75%	41.64%
6B	15.07%	26.87%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 2011-2012)	Baseline 6A – 64.75% 6B – 15.07%
2012 (SY 2012-2013)	6A – No more than 10% decrease over prior year 6B – No more than 10% increase over prior year

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

During the 2011-2012 school year, OSE staff collaborated with a State team with representatives from the Head Start Collaboration Office, Institute for Disability Studies University Program, Mississippi Department of Human Services, Mississippi State Department of Health, and the State Early Childhood Advisory Council to the Governor in the Expanding Opportunities (EO) Initiative, a federally-supported initiative. The purpose of the team is to promote inclusive opportunities for young children with disabilities and their families in community and educational settings. The team developed and began implementation of a State plan to increase inclusion of young children with disabilities in programs serving typically-developing children in the community. OSE staff will continue to collaborate with the State Expanding Opportunities Team during the 2012-2013 school year. The EO Team will focus on conducting a survey of early childhood education providers and families of children with

disabilities to identify barriers to inclusive practices. The results of the surveys will guide future activities of the EO Team. Additional planned activities of the EO Team include:

- a. Developing promotional materials (e.g., brochures, posters, and FAQ documents) for a public awareness/outreach campaign;
- b. Developing training slideshows (e.g., *The Benefits of Inclusion* and *Incorporating Universal Design for Learning in Early Childhood Settings*) that will be used in presentations to various community groups and/or Boards or Committees who advise agencies on policies for early childhood;
- c. Developing talking points for Early Intervention and Local Education Agency staff for discussing inclusion with families.

OSE staff will continue to participate on the State Interagency Coordinating Council with representatives from Part C and Part B programs, parent groups, university programs, Head Start, and other disability programs to increase opportunities for inclusive service provisions for young children.

OSE staff will continue to work with the Office of Curriculum and Instruction in their revision of the State Early Learning Guidelines. The revised standards will promote inclusive practices by incorporating *Universal Design for Learning* principles.

OSE staff will develop materials for a “Train-the-Trainer” series on early childhood inclusive practices. These materials will allow LEA staff to offer training modules to early childhood providers (e.g., private childcare staff and Head Start staff) in their district to promote inclusive practices.

The State 619 Coordinator will continue to collaborate with the Head Start Collaboration office to identify opportunities to support inclusive service provision for young children with disabilities.

The OSE will continue to provide regional training on *Early Childhood Transition* including guidance on inclusive practices during the 2012-2013 school year. The training will include Part C service personnel, Part B district personnel, Head Start directors and child care center directors to better facilitate inclusive practices for young children with disabilities. Trainings will occur in the following locations on the dates noted below:

- Jackson, MS – October 25, 2012
- Tupelo, MS – December 11, 2012
- Hattiesburg, MS – February 5, 2013
- Flowood, MS – April 11, 2013

OSE staff, including the State 619 Coordinator, will provide additional training on *Early Childhood Transition* and *Inclusive Practices in Early Childhood* during the 2012-2013 school year. These trainings will be made at the State Head Start Conference, the State Parent Conference, the Mississippi Early Childhood Association, and additional Head Start or child care meetings.

OSE staff will update the state website with information specific to Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) available to families and LEA staff including information and downloadable content on Least Restrictive Environments in ECSE.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

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 for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

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 = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-2) is a comprehensive assessment that is designed for children from birth through seven years. It was specifically developed for identification of children who may benefit from special services, ongoing progress monitoring, and outcomes assessments.

With the addition of the BDI-2, the MDE will have a reliable, valid, and legally defensible assessment that will help the Department meet the reporting requirements outlined by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), in keeping with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004.

The BDI-2 domains align to the 3 ECO outcomes as follows:

ECO Outcome

- Positive social-emotional skills (Including social relationships)
- Acquiring and using knowledge and skills
- Taking appropriate action to meet needs

BDI-2 Domain

- Personal-Social
- Adaptive and Motor
- Communication and Cognitive

For the Mississippi Assessment of Preschool Skills report, children were placed in categories 1-7 based on the z-score for the outcome area. Each raw score was assigned a corresponding z-score. These z-score ranges were obtained from the

guidelines posted on ECO's website on 07/05/06. This document was titled "ECO Recommendations on Age-Expected Functioning and ECO Scale Points".

For the Mississippi Assessment of Preschool Skills OSEP Outcome Report, children were placed in categories 1-5 based on their performance at Time 1 and Time 2. The category descriptions were taken from ECO's website www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/assets/pdfs/OSEP_Sept_2006_TA_Document.pdf. Reporting Category B refers to the percentage of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. To fall in Reporting Category B, the examiner must document subjective improvements for children that obtained the same or lower score at entry and exit.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data were collected on those students who were 3 to 5 years old in the child count for 2006. A contract was awarded to The Riverside Publishing Company in the fall of 2006 to collect the data needed for this indicator. Training was led by Riverside in four sites across the State. Training was provided for the Riverside web site as well as the BDI-2 screener. Data on the 3 to 5 year old SWD population was pulled from MSIS after the completion of the month one submission from the school districts and sent to Riverside to load into its system. LEAs were then instructed to enter the data they had gathered using the BDI-2. The LEAs had access to the Riverside system from November 1, 2006 to December 5, 2006. During the spring of 2007, the Riverside system was once again opened to allow the LEAs to enter new BDI-2 data. This second data entry was compared to the fall BDI-2 screener for the needed measurements for this Indicator.

Baseline Data was re-established in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) as directed by OSEP to align with new measurements. The new measurement is based on the same set of data as in previous years, but simplifies the reporting of data by using two summary statements to measure progress for each of the three outcome areas.

Baseline Data for FFY 2008 (2007-2008):

Outcome A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	322	6.73%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	376	7.85%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	239	4.99%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	391	8.17%

e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3460	72.26%
Total	N= 4788	100%

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	301	6.27%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	783	16.32%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	440	9.17%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	607	12.65%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2667	55.59%
Total	N= 4798	100%

Outcome C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	310	6.46%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	599	12.49%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	222	4.63%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	338	7.05%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3328	69.38%
Total	N= 4797	100%

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	47%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	80%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	49%

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	68%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	38%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	76%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase the percentage of pre-school children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by 1.0 percentage points to 67.26.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase the percentage of pre-school children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by 1.0 percentage points to 68.26.
2008 (2008-2009)	Baseline: Summary Statement 1: Outcome A - 47% Outcome B – 49% Outcome C – 38% Summary Statement 2: Outcome A – 80% Outcome B – 68% Outcome C – 76%
2009 (2009-2010)	Summary Statement 1: Outcome A - 48% Outcome B – 50% Outcome C – 39% Summary Statement 2: Outcome A – 81% Outcome B – 69% Outcome C – 77%
2010 (2010-2011)	Summary Statement 1: Outcome A - 49% Outcome B – 51% Outcome C – 40% Summary Statement 2: Outcome A – 82% Outcome B – 70% Outcome C – 78%
2011 (2011-2012)	Summary Statement 1: Outcome A - 50% Outcome B – 52% Outcome C – 41% Summary Statement 2: Outcome A – 83% Outcome B – 71% Outcome C – 79%

<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>Summary Statement 1: Outcome A - 51% Outcome B – 53% Outcome C – 42% Summary Statement 2: Outcome A – 83% Outcome B – 72% Outcome C – 80%</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be used to assist in the provision of technical assistance through 2012:

- Provide webinar training on the Riverside Publishing Company web system each fall.
- Allow data entry of BDI-2 beginning with the start of school in August through the child count day each year and each spring (April through May).
- Use feedback from the Mississippi Pre-School Skills Assessment to determine identified areas of technical assistance needs for district personnel working with pre-school students in the areas of positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet student needs.
- The OSE will provide technical assistance to districts to meet the needs of children with disabilities age 3-5.
- The OSE has established an interagency agreement with the Mississippi Department of Health to ensure a smooth transition from Part C to B and to ensure services that provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) to children with disabilities beginning at age 3.
- The OSE will continue to evaluate the services and programs offered to children ages 3-5 to ensure a FAPE.
- The OSE will conduct quarterly meetings with SPED directors and address issues relative to children ages 3-5.
- The OSE will collaborate with the Mississippi Department of Health, the lead agency for Part C (Early Interventions) to provide technical assistance and joint training endeavors for children ages 3-5.
- The OSE will develop monitoring procedures to verify compliance during on-site visits. Two pilot districts will be monitored during the spring of 2008. Additional districts will be scheduled for the fall of 2008.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Mississippi works with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) and has received the survey developed by NCSEAM. An RFP was planned to be issued to select an organization to distribute surveys to a sample of parents and to collect and compile resulting data in order to provide baseline data in the February 1, 2007 APR. A stratified random sampling technique would have been used to sample the target population. This method of data collection was not implemented after discussion with the stakeholders.

Mississippi will be updating its collection process beginning with FFY 2008 (SY 2008 – 2009). Mississippi has been in discussion with its stakeholders several times concerning Indicator 8. The consensus reached is that each LEA should survey their parents annually. Proposed changes for Indicator 8 data, Mississippi will begin collection during school year 2008-2009 and will report in the 2010 APR, for an annual review of the Parent Survey to include:

- Use of an interactive web page to collect demographic data (race/ethnicity, gender, and disability) and survey questions
- Use of the shortened NCSEAM validated survey, Mississippi selected ten questions that would best represent their parent population
- Inclusion of at least two additional versions of the interactive web page in other languages (Spanish and Vietnamese) by SY 2010 – 2011
- Use of a back-end secure database to collect and store the data from the interactive web page for reporting purposes
- Allow LEAs to use the interactive password protected web page with their parents

during the annual renewal of the IEP Committee Meeting in a center-based computer center (e.g. media center, library, computer room, etc.)

- All 152 Mississippi LEAs will be represented annually
- LEAs will assist parents with the interactive web page in any manner needed by the parent (e.g. pages may need to be read to parent, guide parent through the web page, assist parents in submitting their completed survey, etc.)
- MDE will collect, store, and analyze the data for each of the 152 LEAs within the state annually
- MDE will report data collected in this census manner in the APR due 2010
- MDE will provide public reporting of data for Indicator 8 by LEA for FFY 2009 (SY 2008-2009)

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2005)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

During the 2005-2006 school year surveys were sent to parents of children with disabilities in eleven school districts being monitored. Of the surveys distributed to parents of children with disabilities in these eleven districts, a total of 641 parent surveys were returned to the OSE. From the survey, OSE staff identified at least eight statements on the survey, which specifically address parental involvement. One specific question was identified as the item for which to base the measurement of the percentage of parents that reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 63.46.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 65.46.

<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 67.46.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 69.46.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 71.46.</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 73.46.</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by 2.0 percentage points to 75.46.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Use results of parent survey to identify areas of technical assistance needs.

Provide technical assistance for school districts to facilitate greater parental involvement.

Continue identifying problems through focused monitoring/parent focus group meetings and discussing issues as part of the on-site monitoring activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2011, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2011 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2012. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Description of how data are collected: MDE calculates representation of racial groups in special education using data collected through the statewide student level database Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). Each of the 152 public school districts plus the 10 State agencies are required to report their child count data to the MSIS database, entering multiple data elements for every student, including Race, Eligibility Date, IEP Date, Primary Disability, Related Services, and other data elements needed for other calculations and systems. Upon the completion of the child count, a snapshot is taken of the students who were indicated as being eligible for Special Education and are being served. A procedure is then run that reviews each student's enrollment and withdrawal data so that only those students that have an enrollment code on the child count date are pulled into the child count table. From this table, the data are pulled for reporting purposes. An analysis of the data by district is conducted by race by disability.

Definition of “disproportionate representation”: Mississippi has defined “disproportionate representation” as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater. Mississippi defines underrepresentation as an alternate risk ratio of 0.25, which is the inverse of an alternate risk ratio of 4.0. When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the MDE/OSE will conduct multiple analyses to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center definition which states, disproportionality exists when a group is represented at a disproportionate rate higher than the group’s representation in the population; all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered.

The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the racial/ethnic group for the LEA is greater than or equal to 10. The equation used to calculate the alternate risk ratio is:

- Alternate risk ratio = LEA-level risk for racial/ethnic group for students with disabilities divided by State-level risk for comparison group for students with disabilities

The equation used to calculate LEA level risk is:

- (The number of SWD of a specific race/ethnicity divided by the total number of students enrolled with the same specific race/ethnicity) times 100

The equation used to calculate State level risk is:

- (The number of SWD in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined divided by the total number of students enrolled in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined) times 100

For example, to determine if disproportionate representation exists for Black students, the calculation is:

$$\frac{(\# \text{ of Black SWD in LEA} / \# \text{ of Black Students Enrolled in LEA}) * 100}{(\# \text{ of Non-Black SWD in the State} / \# \text{ of Non-Black Students Enrolled in the State}) * 100}$$

The number of SWD in each race/ethnicity category is taken from child count data, also known as 618 Table 1 data. The enrollment numbers are taken from the Month 1 Net Membership data in the State database.

Mississippi also reviewed the SEAC definition which states that disproportionality exists when a group is represented at a disproportionate rate higher than the group’s representation in the population; all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered.

The determination of noncompliance is a two-step process. First, each LEA’s data is examined to determine if disproportionate representation is identified in the population of students. The second step is to determine whether or not the disproportionate

representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Noncompliance is only existent when inappropriate identification is the cause for the disproportionate representation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Baseline Data was re-established in FFY 2009. In prior years, Mississippi calculated disproportionate representation for 4 areas: Indicator 1, Indicator 2, Indicator 4a, and child count. Upon receiving clarification from OSEP on the reporting requirements of Indicator 9, the State will only report on the disproportionate representation of the child count data in the future.

Six LEAs were identified as having disproportionate overrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. Of those six, none were found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. No districts were found to have underrepresentation in special education and related services.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Child count data will be examined as explained above to ensure there is no over or under representation. Underrepresentation will not be calculated for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 due to a change in the measurement table.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator
2006 (2006-2007)	0
2007 (2007-2008)	0
2008 (2008-2009)	0
2009 (2009-2010)	0
2010 (2010-2011)	0

<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>0 (Overrepresentation only)</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>0 (Overrepresentation only)</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be continued and updated through school year 2012-2013:

- MDE staff for data collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting in coordination with the data consultant will conduct annual verification of data collection and entry to determine whether the child find and disproportionality data are accurate, valid, and reliable according to the eligibility determination criteria of Mississippi.

The MDE will continue to:

- Develop and maintain a website of information, links, and other items related to LRE, child find, and disproportionality <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/special-education/special-education-mattie-t>.
- Develop and distribute a tool for use by LEAs that examines policies, procedures, and practices related to the provision, under IDEA 2004, of nondiscriminatory assessment and the examination of significant disproportionality resulting from inappropriate identification.
- Upon the OSE’s determination of significant disproportionality with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities or the placement in particular education settings of these children, Mississippi has required the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LEA.
- The MDE has also committed time, fiscal, and personnel resources to address Response to Intervention (Rtl) which supports district personnel as they address the academic and behavioral concerns of students in Mississippi classrooms. To ensure that Mississippi’s educational personnel meet the diverse needs of students the following activities have been implemented to address the academic and behavioral needs of students:
- Conduct various Rtl work sessions comprised of key MDE staff to determine what has been done in the area of Rtl in Mississippi, establish outcomes for future work (goals/objectives), and to establish specific actions/next steps to accomplish the goals and objectives.

- The MDE will partner with multiple TA providers in a concerted and collaborative effort to address RtI. These TA providers will include: the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), the Southeastern Regional Resource Center (SERRC), and the Southeastern Equity Center (SEC).
- Establish a State team to work collaboratively around RtI. Mississippi's state team is comprised of the Associate State Superintendent of Academic Education, the Director and one staff member from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of the Office of Reading, Early Childhood, and Language Arts, and an affiliate of the Mississippi Chapter of the National Education Association (NEA).
- The RtI State team will attend the National Center on Response to Intervention's National Summit: Improving Achievement for ALL students to become a partner in supporting this important endeavor.
- The RtI State team will develop a comprehensive statewide Implementation/Action Plan to support and enhance implementation of RtI while attending the National Summit.
- Establish a Collaborative RtI Task Force facilitated by the TA providers noted above (SEDL, SERRC, and SEC) and comprised of MDE staff in Leadership positions, external consultants (representatives of Mississippi's Institutions of Higher Learning [IHL]), a Mississippi State Board of Education member, and a representative from an out-of-state university with experience addressing RtI initiatives.
- The MDE will develop and disseminate a guidance manual for use by school district personnel, ***The Three Tier Instructional Model***, designed to provide support to students who are struggling academically and who experience behavioral difficulties in the school or classroom settings.
- Training will be provided to LEA personnel on ***The Three Tier Instructional Model***.
- A Train the Trainer (TOT) session will be provided on ***The Three Tier Instructional Model*** to build capacity of potential trainers to meet the technical assistance needs of school personnel across the state.
- Contractual consultants will be hired to develop Mississippi's RtI Policies and will be used to provide technical assistance in the area of Positive Behavioral Supports on a statewide basis.
- Allow LEAs to use up to 15% as part of the amount of allowed CEIS funding the LEA receives under Part B of the Act to develop and implement coordinated early intervening services that need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in the general education environment.

- Allow activities in implementing coordinated early intervening services such as, but not limited to providing educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports that can be used to address student needs in the areas of academic and behavior.

Training is being provided to various groups regarding the Three Tiered process (Summer Institute, MDE staff, MASS, MAPS, special education personnel, and parents).

- Mississippi's Rtl Model is designed to:
 - Improve upon many of the problems associated with the ability-achievement discrepancy model which has dominated eligibility practices for the past 25 plus years;
 - Prevent the "wait to fail" model and ensure that students receive remedial services before the academic concerns become so severe that a discrepancy can be obtained; and
 - Prevent over-identification in special education and address over-representation of minorities in special education.
- The MDE will continue to require each LEA to submit an annual self-assessment as part of the annual project application process addressing the LEA's review of data and compliance. The self-assessment submitted must identify how the LEA will utilize the results of the self-assessment to implement effective changes in policies, procedures, and practices.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2011, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2011, i.e., after June 30, 2012. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Description of how data are collected: MDE calculates representation of racial groups in special education using data collected through the statewide student level database Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). Each of the 152 public school districts plus the 10 State agencies are required to report their child count data to the MSIS database, entering multiple data elements for every student, including Race, Eligibility Date, IEP Date, Primary Disability, Related Services, and other data elements needed for other calculations and systems. Upon the completion of the child count, a snapshot is taken of the students who were indicated as being eligible for Special Education and are being served. A procedure is then run that reviews each student's enrollment and withdrawal data so that only those students that have an enrollment code on the child count date are pulled into the child count table. From this table, the data are pulled for reporting purposes. An analysis of the data by district is conducted by race by disability.

Definition of “disproportionate representation”: Mississippi has defined “disproportionate representation” as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater. Mississippi defines underrepresentation as an alternate risk ratio of 0.25, which is the inverse of an alternate risk ratio of 4.0. When disproportionate representation is determined for a district, the MDE/OSE will conduct multiple analyses to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center definition which states, disproportionality exists when a group is represented at a disproportionate rate higher than the group’s representation in the population; all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Mississippi reviewed the two methods recommended by Westat in calculating disproportionality, weighted risk ratio and alternate risk ratio. Using each method, OSE then applied an N count of 40. This is the approved N count used in the State’s NCLB calculations. After reviewing both methods, it was decided that the alternate risk ratio was better suited for the State. OSE then reviewed the number of districts that were being pulled into the review with an N count of 40. It was decided that the numbers of districts being reviewed was too small for a thorough data analysis of the state. Therefore, OSE changed the N count to 10 to allow for the review of more districts. Once the N count was established, OSE turned its review to the target cut point. Research indicated that states are using a cut point between 4.0 and 2.0. After reviewing the data and much discussion, it was decided that OSE would use a cut point of 2.5, which allows for a review of more data. The cut point was raised to 4.0 beginning in FFY 2007.

Mississippi made a decision to calculate an alternate risk ratio for each district in order to determine disproportionality by using the document, “Methods for Accessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide”. This guide explained that if a district has small numbers of students in either the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group then using an alternate risk ratio is the better choice over the weighted risk ratio. The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the racial/ethnic group for the district is greater than or equal to 10. The equation used to calculate the alternate risk ratio is:

Alternate risk ratio = District level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability or educational environment category divided by State level risk for comparison group for disability or educational environment category

Over-representation: Minimum N = 10; Ratio cut point = 2.5

- a. SLD = 0 districts with disproportionate representation (# of districts that met minimum $N > 10 = 150$) – **Target Met**
- b. EmD = 3 districts with disproportionate representation of 152 districts (2.0%) (# of districts that met minimum $N > 10 = 46$) – **Target Not Met.**
- c. L/S = 0 districts with disproportionate representation (# of districts the met minimum $N > 10 = 148$) – **Target Met.**
- d. OHI = 5 districts with disproportionate representation of 152 districts (3.3%) (# of districts that met minimum $N > 10 = 106$) – **Target Not Met.**
- e. AU = 0 district with disproportionate representation (# of districts that met minimum $N > 10 = 20$) – **Target Met.**
- f. **ID** = 0 districts with disproportionate representation (# of districts that met minimum $N > 10 = 129$) – **Target Met.**

One of the districts that exceeded the 2.5 ratio cut point in EmD, they offer a day treatment program specifically designed for SWD with emotional disabilities. This program would naturally increase the EmD numbers for this particular district.

Additionally, one of the districts that exceeded the 2.5 ratio cut point for OHI has the only comprehensive medical center in North East Mississippi. Surrounding districts send many of their OHI students to this district due to the unique services it can provide.

Under-Representation:

Mississippi conducted data analysis to investigation under-representation of three racial/ethnicity groups (Hispanic, Native American, and Asian). After reviewing the document, “Q & A Under-representation 011008.doc,” posted on the Regional Resource & Federal Center Network website, the State used an under-representation ratio of 0.40 and 0.25. These analyses were conducted for each of the six disability categories requested (SLD, EmD, L/S, OHI, AU, and **ID**). For the Native American categories, there are fewer than 10 students statewide in the EmD, AU, and **ID** disability groups; fewer than 15 students in the OHI disability group; and fewer than 20 in the L/S disability category. For the Asian group, there are fewer than 15 students statewide in the OHI disability category and fewer than 10 students in the EmD and AU disability categories. For the Hispanic category, there are fewer than 15 students statewide in the AU disability category; fewer than 20 students in the EmD disability group; and fewer than 40 students in the OHI disability categories. Working with low n-counts such as these, does not create statistically sound results. The risk of over-identifying districts with under-representation is possible.

2006-2007	All Students		Students with Disabilities 6-21	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	229,849	46.5%	26,528	44.9%

Black	250,928	50.8%	31,726	53.7%
Asian	4,064	0.8%	194	0.33%
Hispanic	8,346	1.7%	520	0.88%
Native American	948	0.2%	112	0.19%
Total	494,135	100%	59,080	100%

Listed in the table above are the enrollment figures for ALL students and SWD students in the State of Mississippi for school year 2006-2007. The percentage of students that make up the Hispanic, Native American, and Asian ethnicity groups comprise less than 3% of the total student population and less than 2% of the SWD population. Therefore, due to the low numbers of enrollment in the Asian, Hispanic, and Native American races within our State, MDE does not show any under-representation in the six disabilities that it was required to review. Underrepresentation will not be calculated for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 due to a change in the measurement table.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target					
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator					
2006 (2006-2007)	SLD = 0	EmD = 0	L/S = 0	OHI = 0	AU = 0	ID = 0
2007 (2007-2008)	SLD = 0	EmD = 0	L/S = 0	OHI = 0	AU = 0	ID = 0
2008 (2008-2009)	SLD = 0	EmD = 0	L/S = 0	OHI = 0	AU = 0	ID = 0
2009 (2009-2010)	SLD = 0	EmD = 0	L/S = 0	OHI = 0	AU = 0	ID = 0
2010 (2010-2011)	SLD = 0	EmD = 0	L/S = 0	OHI = 0	AU = 0	ID = 0

<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>SLD = 0 EmD = 0 L/S = 0 OHI = 0 AU = 0 ID = 0 (Overrepresentation Only)</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>SLD = 0 EmD = 0 L/S = 0 OHI = 0 AU = 0 ID = 0 (Overrepresentation Only)</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be continued and updated through school year 2012-2013:

MDE staff for data collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting in coordination with the data consultant will conduct annual verification of data collection and entry to determine whether the child find and disproportionality data are accurate, valid, and reliable according to the eligibility determination criteria of Mississippi.

The MDE has:

- Provided targeted technical assistance to selected LEAs on reevaluation practices that will facilitate the reexamination of eligibility determinations for intellectual disabilities (ID) and specific learning disabilities using a specially designed monitoring protocol.
- Developed and maintained a website of information, links, and other items related to LRE, child find, and disproportionality.

The MDE provided technical assistance to select LEAs from July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007:

- Twenty districts were selected for an onsite visit (SLD).
- Regional TA workshops were offered to 70 districts in the priority area of SLD.

Upon the OSE’s determination of significant disproportionality with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, Mississippi has required the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LEA.

The activities addressed in Indicator 9 relative to Rtl will be continued to support Indicator 10 improvement activities:

- Regional TA workshops will be offered to LEAs covering SLD. The MDE has also committed time, fiscal and personnel resources to address Response to Intervention (Rtl) which supports district personnel as they address the academic and behavioral concerns of students in Mississippi classrooms.
- The rationale for implementing Rtl within Mississippi schools is two-fold. Rtl is both a) a useful framework for guiding instruction for all students in general and special education by means of a continuum of services and b) a legal and valid approach for identifying SWD. To ensure that Mississippi's educational personnel meet the diverse needs of students and appropriately identify a child as a child with a disability, the following activities have been implemented by the Department to address the academic and behavioral needs of students:
 - Conduct various Rtl work sessions comprised of key MDE staff to determine what has been done in the area of Rtl in Mississippi, establish outcomes for future work (goals/objectives), and to establish specific actions/next steps to accomplish the goals and objectives.
 - Partner with multiple TA providers in a concerted and collaborative effort to address Rtl. These TA providers include: the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), the Southeastern Regional Resource Center (SERRC), and the Southeastern Equity Center (SEC).
 - Establish a State team to work collaboratively around Rtl. Mississippi's State team is comprised of the Associate State Superintendent of Academic Education, the Director and one staff member from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of the Office of Reading, Early Childhood, and Language Arts, and an affiliate of the Mississippi Chapter of the National Education Association (NEA).
 - The Rtl State team will attend the National Center on Response to Intervention's National Summit: Improving Achievement for ALL students to become a partner in supporting this important endeavor.
 - The Rtl State team will develop a Comprehensive Statewide Implementation/Action Plan to support and enhance implementation of Rtl while attending the National Summit.
 - Establish a Collaborative Rtl Task Force facilitated by the TA providers noted above (SEDL, SERRC, and SEC) and comprised of MDE staff in Leadership positions, external consultants (representatives of Mississippi's Institutions of Higher Learning [IHL]), a Mississippi State Board of Education member, and a representative from an out-of-state university with experience addressing Rtl initiatives.
 - The MDE will develop and disseminate a guidance manual for use by school district personnel, ***The Three Tier Instructional Model***, designed to provide support to

students who are struggling academically and who experience **behavioral** difficulties in the school or classroom settings.

- Training will be provided to LEA personnel on ***The Three Tier Instructional Model***.
- A Train the Trainer (TOT) session will be provided on ***The Three Tier Instructional Model*** to build capacity of potential trainers to meet the technical assistance needs of school personnel across the state.
- Contractual consultants will be hired to develop Mississippi's Rtl Policies and will be used to provide technical assistance in the area of Positive Behavioral Supports on a statewide basis.
- Allow LEAs to use up to 15% as part of the allowed CEIS funding amount the LEA receives under Part B of the Act to develop and implement coordinated early intervening services that need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in the general education environment.
- Allow activities in implementing coordinated, early intervening services such as, but not limited to providing educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports are being used to address student needs in the areas of academic and behavior.
- Training will be provided to various groups regarding the Three Tiered process (Summer Institute, MDE staff, MASS, MAPS, special education personnel, and parents).
- Mississippi's Rtl Model will be designed to:
 - Improve upon many of the problems associated with the ability-achievement discrepancy model which has dominated eligibility practices for the past 25 plus years;
 - Prevent the "wait to fail" model and will ensure that students receive remedial services before the academic concerns become so severe that a discrepancy can be obtained; and
 - Prevent over-identification in special education and addresses over-representation of minorities in special education.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Beginning in 2005-06, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) added a component that tracks timelines for intervention, assessment, and eligibility. LEAs must enter dates that students are referred for instructional or behavioral interventions, the date they are referred for comprehensive assessment (if interventions are not successful and a disability is suspected) subject to parental consent, eligibility ruling date, and IEP date. MSIS tracks the established timelines for each step and MDE will have the capability to generate reports indicating the number and percentage of students in each district and statewide that were evaluated in accordance with timelines. In June 2006, MDE will have baseline data to provide in the February 1, 2007 APR.

Mississippi has established a timeline of 60 days to evaluate a child and determine eligibility under IDEA beginning with the date the Local Survey Committee refers a child for a Comprehensive Assessment. (Note: an initial evaluation will not be initiated until the parent provides written parental permission to evaluate. However, in MS the initial evaluation timeline includes the gathering of all information, completion of the assessment, and holding the eligibility determination meeting within 60 days of a child being referred for a comprehensive assessment by the LSC.)

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY2005 (2005-2006)

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 196
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days = 14
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days = 125

Percent = $((14 + 125)/196) * 100 = 70.92\%$ **Target Not Met**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be continued and updated through school year 2012-2013:

- MDE staff in the data division will generate reports indicating the number and percentage of students in each district and statewide that were evaluated in accordance with timelines.
- Staff in the data division annually will conduct desktop audits by reviewing and analyzing district and state reports to determine compliance with this indicator.
- LEAs that are not compliant with this indicator will be notified in writing and are required to develop and implement corrective actions to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.
- Reports will be generated quarterly for any LEA found to be noncompliant to track compliance with this indicator following the OSE's notification to the LEA of noncompliance with the established timelines.
- Training will be provided on an annual basis following the review and analysis of the district and State reports and incorporates issues or concerns obtained through feedback provided by the MSIS users.
- Eligibility timelines will be monitored by monitoring staff conducting on-site focused monitoring visits when reviewing eligibility records. Findings of noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than 12 months from identification of noncompliance.
- Information will be disseminated via the OSE Listserv regarding data entry in MSIS relative to Indicator 11 and the requirement to conduct initial evaluations and make an initial eligibility determination within 60 days of a child's referral by the LSC for a comprehensive assessment.
- OSE will add a component in MSIS to ensure timelines for instructional interventions, assessment, and eligibility were conducted in accordance with established timelines. Specifically, with regard to the initial evaluation and determination of eligibility, all students referred for an initial comprehensive assessment were assessed and a determination of eligibility made within 60 days of the date of referral by the Local Survey Committee for a comprehensive assessment.
- MSIS tracks the established timelines for each step and OSE has the capability to generate reports indicating the number and percentage of students in each district and statewide that were evaluated in accordance with timelines.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: (NOTE: Cannot be less than 100%) 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # 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.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. 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)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Data from Part C were imported into the Special Education database and an analysis performed using the Part B child count data to determine if the child transitioned from C to B by the age of 3. Analyses include a review of the child's date of birth, eligibility and IEP date to conclude whether children who were eligible for Part B were served by their third birthday.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

FFY2005 (2005-2006):

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination = 329
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays = 0 (there was no mechanism to collect this data in 2005-2006)
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays = 168

Percent: $(168 / (329 - 0)) * 100 = 51\%$ - **Target Not Met**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2006 (2006-2007)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2007 (2007-2008)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2008 (2008-2009)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2009 (2009-2010)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2010 (2010-2011)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2011 (2011-2012)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.
2012 (2012-2013)	Mississippi will increase the number of eligible children transitioning from Part C to Part B, receiving services at age 3 to 100%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MDE and the Lead Agency for Part C, Mississippi Department of Health (MDH), will coordinate electronic data systems in order to collect accurate information relative to this Indicator. The MDE will provide data to LEAs that include the percentage of eligible students receiving services at age 3. MDE will provide professional materials and training activities to LEAs on effective service delivery options for children ages 3-5.

The following activities will be continued and updated through 2012-2013.

- MDE and the Lead Agency for Part C, MDH, will coordinate electronic data systems in order to collect accurate information relative to this Indicator. The MDE will provide data to LEAs that include the percentage of eligible students receiving

services at age 3. MDE will provide professional materials and training activities to LEAs on effective service delivery options for serving children ages 3-5.

- The MDE and the MDH will continue to collect and analyze data relative to Part C and Part B outcomes and to collaborate on the implementation of a statewide child find campaign to identify, locate, and evaluate children with disabilities ages birth through 21.
- The MDE and the MDH will establish an interagency agreement which addresses responsibility between the two lead agencies for Part C and B respectively in the areas of child find and transition.
- MDE staff will continue to annually review the interagency agreement in an effort to determine current compliance status of the agreement between MDE and MDH. If problems are identified, a report specifying problems, solutions, and timelines for implementation will be developed cooperatively with agency personnel.
- MDE personnel will provide technical assistance as needed to help resolve any problems noted through the annual review of the interagency agreement.
- The MDE will support the training activities provided by the MDH, lead agency for Part C, and to work collaboratively with the Part C service providers to ensure a smooth transition from Part C to Part B.
- The MDE will be responsible for the statewide coordination of the planning and implementation of the child find identification, location, and evaluation effort.
- The MDE will evaluate the implementation of policies and procedures that promote a smooth transition of children from Part C to Part B, most specifically, the requirement that children eligible for Part C services who also are found to be eligible for Part B services, have a transition planning conference no later than 33 months of age.
- The MDE will provide funding for teachers of children with disabilities birth through two years of age to districts that voluntarily choose to provide educational services to this age group.
- The MDE will provide Parent Awareness Trainings collaboratively with various state agencies, specifically, the MDH and the Mississippi Department of Mental Health (MDMH), utilizing staff from these two offices to address requirements of these agencies as they relate to and impact the transition from Part C to Part B.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A variety of methods will be used to determine performance on this indicator.

1. The Statement of Assurances required as part of the LEA project application will include assurance from the LEA superintendent that all students aged 16 and above have IEPs that conform with this requirement.
2. An element will be added in MSIS for districts to indicate whether applicable IEPs include coordinated measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. MDE will analyze data from MSIS to determine the percentage of students for whom LEAs report compliance.
3. A sample of IEPs will be reviewed in districts selected for focused monitoring on the indicator of LRE. Districts are divided into one of four enrollment groups and then ranked according to performance on LRE. Lowest performing districts in each enrollment group are selected for monitoring. Eight districts are targeted in LRE each year, and follow up visits are conducted in districts on corrective action plans.

The SEA will analyze the above information and report baseline data in the February 1, 2007 APR.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

10800 / 11549 = 93.51% - Target Not Met.

Data were pulled from the 2006-2007 SPED snap-shot for any student who was age 16 or older on the child count day. An Excel spreadsheet was created for each district. The district was requested to complete the spreadsheet indicating if the student had an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. OSE had a return rate of 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%

2012 (2012-2013)	100%
-----------------------------	------

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

- Training will continue to be provided annually regarding the requirement for LEAs to develop and implement IEPs, in accordance with all of the requirements of 34 C.F.C. 300.320, including transition services beginning no later than the first IEP to be in effect when a student turns 16, or younger if deemed appropriate by the IEP committee.
- The staff member responsible for secondary transition is also responsible for the provision of training related to transition components of the IEP and transition services. These training opportunities, provided annually to district personnel include specific information related to transition components of the IEP, the Mississippi occupational diploma, and the transitional portfolio.
- The training provided by the OSE addresses the requirement that IEPs of students ages 16 and above (or younger if deemed appropriate by the IEP committee) will include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to the areas of training, education, employment and where appropriate, independent living skills and the transition services, including the courses of study needed to assist the child in reaching those goals. A joint conference was held in the fall of 2006 with the Department of Rehabilitation Services.
- Training will also be done annually by OSE data staff relative to the collection of data (new data elements have been added to address this Indicator) and analysis of data collected.
- A review of IEPs will be completed by monitoring staff conducting on-site visits. IEPs of students ages 16 and above will be reviewed to determine whether the annual goals are coordinated and measurable. Also a review is made to determine if transition services are reasonable to enable students to meet post-secondary goals.
- Information will be disseminated to LEAs via the OSE listserv regarding the transition requirements addressed in 34 C.F.R. 300.320.
- Findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 13 will be issued to LEAs in written monitoring reports and require corrective actions (implementation of an improvement plan) as soon as possible, but in no case, later than 12 months from identification.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14:

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Because of changes to the measurement and reporting for Indicator 14, Mississippi set new baselines and targets in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, data collection was moved to the State database through an update to the State’s online student data collection interface. In previous years, information was collected by sending LEAs a spreadsheet with a list of students who exited the previous year. Changes to the reporting categories for the 2008–2009 school year were reflected in the online data collection.

- A Post-Secondary Update screen exists in the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to collect data for Indicator 14. The screen automatically populates a list of students who exited the prior year for each LEA. Demographic information as well as the exit type (Graduated with regular high school diploma, graduated with occupational diploma, etc.) is displayed for each student. LEAs are required to indicate the status of each student. A comment field is also available to the LEAs to document special circumstances and contact attempts.
- A Post-Secondary Update report was also created to enable LEAs to view all of the information from the update screen on one localized report.

Data was collected for the FFY 2009 reporting period for students who exited school in the 2008-2009 school year. Collecting data through the State database allowed for a more centralized, complete, and accurate data collection process. There was a 100% LEA participation rate and an 87% response rate for the target leaver group. A total of 2,806 students responded to the survey conducted by the LEAs.

Baseline Data for FFY2009 (2009-2010):

Measurement	% of Students
A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	61%
C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	78%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data for Indicator 14 demonstrates a high percentage of SWD are positively engaged in a form of education or employment within one year of leaving school.

Districts reported that 55% of students receiving a regular high diploma were enrolled in higher education, demonstrating that the majority of students with regular diplomas choose to continue their education. Districts reported that 41% of students that received a certificate or modified diploma, including Mississippi’s Occupational Diploma, were most likely to be competitively employed. This demonstrates the ability of the

Occupational Diploma program to effectively prepare students for gainful employment upon exit from school.

Districts reported that 44% of students that dropped out were not engaged in any form of education or employment and that 31% of dropouts were competitively employed. The numbers concerning dropouts clearly demonstrates the importance of decreasing the dropout rate for SWD.

Of the students that were not engaged, the majority of responses fell into three categories (when comments were entered): Student is unable to work or attend school due to a medical disability and is being cared for at home or in a facility; Student is incarcerated; or Student is a stay-at-home caregiver to one or more children.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase the number of competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school by 1.0, from 58.97 to 59.97%.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase the number of competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school by 1.0, from 59.97% to 60.97%.
2008 (2008-2009)	Increase the number of competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school by 2.0, from 60.97% to 62.97%.
2009 (2009-2010)	Baseline A. 24% B. 61% C. 78%
2010 (2010-2011)	A. 26% B. 63% C. 80%

<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>A. 28% B. 65% C. 82%</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>A. 30% B. 67% C. 84%</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities will be used to assist in the provision of technical assistance through 2012:

- Each LEA has a compulsory school attendance officer assigned to it. LEAs are encouraged to utilize the school attendance officers to find students who exited the previous year.
- A screen will be created in MSIS that can be populated in April listing students who exited the previous school year offering LEAs the maximum amount of time possible to find these students.
- LEAs will develop tracking systems for exiting students to optimize their contact rate.
- OSE staff will continue to conduct frequent reviews of the NPSO website and provide updates and news to the school districts within the state.
- An OSE Team will attend the Secondary Transition State Planning Institute: Building for the future to assist with the planning of capacity building activities designed to improve secondary transition services for SWD and to obtain information relative to the SPP/APR secondary transition indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14, specifically with regard to data collection, reporting, and use.
- OSE staff will address Indicator 14 through the quarterly meetings conducted with Directors of Special Education.
- OSE staff will continue to participate in the NPSO monthly teleconferences and will continue to network with other states that participate in these regularly scheduled teleconferences.
- The transition portfolio, first introduced in 2002-2003, will continue as a requirement document that serves as a practical tool for documenting the efforts of the student, his/her family, teachers, and other service providers to ensure a smooth transition to

post-school opportunities and services. The transition portfolio is required for all students whose IEP indicates that they will exit high school with an option other than a standard diploma or an occupational diploma.

- OSE will provide transitional training to the LEAs during annual IEP, transitional, and occupational diploma training.
- OSE will support and participate in an annual Transitional Conference with the Mississippi Department of Rehabilitation Services (MDRS).
- OSE has established an interagency agreement with MDRS to ensure a cooperative partnership between the two agencies.
- The State has a high school redesign initiative that is restructuring secondary program options for all students. All students will have a targeted exiting option that includes higher education at a four year college or university, post-secondary community college, or entering the work-force. Academic and vocational curriculum has been blended to center on seven career pathways and ensure transition from high school to adulthood. OSE will work closely with other MDE offices on the high school redesign to ensure inclusion and appropriate services for all SWD.

NPSO Response Calculator		Representativeness							
	Overall	LD	ED	MR	AO	Female	Minority	ELL	Dropout
Target Leaver Totals	3222	2251	130	373	468	1113	2047	1	398
Response Totals	2806	1982	104	313	407	970	1787	1	280
Target Leaver Representation		69.86%	4.03%	11.58%	14.53%	34.54%	63.53%	0.03%	12.35%
Respondent Representation		70.63%	3.71%	11.15%	14.50%	34.57%	63.68%	0.04%	9.98%
Difference		0.77%	-0.33%	-0.42%	-0.02%	0.03%	0.15%	0.00%	-2.37%

Note: positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation. A difference of greater than +/-3% is highlighted in red. We encourage users to also read the Westat/NPSO paper Post-School Outcomes: Response Rates and Non-response Bias, found on the NPSO website at <http://www.psocenter.org/collecting.html>.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: (NOTE: Cannot be less than 100%) General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MDE/OSE is authorized under 37-23-5 of Mississippi Code 1972 to “foster, inspect, approve, and administer a program of education for exceptional children.” It is the responsibility of the MDE/OSE to ensure implementation of the mandates of federal and State laws and regulations regarding the provision of programs, services, and protections to Mississippi children and youths with disabilities. The MDE/OSE through its accreditation process and Interagency Agreements assumes general supervisory responsibility for all educational programs for children with disabilities in other State agencies. These agencies are monitored to ensure compliance with the policies and procedures in accordance with the approved monitoring policy. Within the State’s general supervision system, the OSE implements the MPIM (Mississippi Program Improvement Monitoring) process of focused monitoring, formal complaints, mediation, and due process hearings. Additionally, all schools (public, state-operated, and non-public) must meet the State’s accreditation standards in order to receive funding. Standard 23.3 requires all agencies and schools under the supervision of the SEA to comply with state and federal law, as well as the *Modified Mattie T. Consent Decree*.

Standard 23.3 Special Education {MS Code 37-23-1 through 9} (SB Policies IDDF and Federal Code) [See *Mississippi Policies and Procedures regarding Children with Disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (IDEA-97)* and the *Modified Mattie T. Consent Decree*.]

Suspected compliance violations may be reported through any of the above mentioned mechanisms (i.e., focused monitoring, complaints, mediation, due process), or through reports from other program offices or local citizens. If there is reason to suspect a violation, evidence of compliance is requested from the district or school and a site visit is conducted, if necessary.

The MPIM focused monitoring process is in its third year of implementation. During the 2004-2005 school year, twenty-four LEAs were selected for focused monitoring in three priority areas. Districts have one year from the date the report was issued to correct noncompliance. All twenty-four LEAs have submitted improvement plans which have been approved by the OSE and all are implementing corrective actions. Quarterly reports providing updates on the approved improvement activities are submitted to the OSE on an individually scheduled basis dependent on when the focused monitoring visit was scheduled and the date the final report was issued.

Follow-up visits are conducted to determine whether noncompliance has been corrected. LEAs are only released from improvement activities when there is demonstrated evidence that all improvement plan activities have been effectively implemented and the annual target for the applicable priority area has been met.

For LEAs who do not correct noncompliance within one year from the time of identification, graduated levels of sanctions are implemented by the MDE/OSE. There are three levels of sanctions as noted:

Level One Sanction includes:

- Notification to the Office of Accreditation that the LEA has failed to meet Accreditation Standard 23.3
- Reporting of Non-Accredited status by the Office of Accreditation

Level Two Sanctions include:

- Meeting with the State Board of Education to present the CAP
- Appointment by MDE of a Special Education Consultant to assist with implementation of the CAP at LEA expense.

Level Three Sanctions include:

- Withholding of Part B funds.

The MDE utilizes the following actions with districts who are implementing CAP activities, but have not met the applicable annual target:

- Follow-up visits completed by staff in the monitoring division
- Quarterly reports from LEAs on CAPs
- Written responses to LEAs following receipt of Quarterly Reports

- Technical assistance provided by staff in the Division of Technical Assistance
- Technical assistance provided by Technical Assistance Specialists assigned to the three Regional Service Centers
- Graduated Levels of Sanctions previously noted

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. a. 70 noncompliant findings were cited between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005.
 - b. Of the 23 in which the districts have had 12 months to correct the noncompliance, 70% (N=16) have been corrected.
- B. All findings of noncompliance were reported under A or C.
- C. a. Noncompliance was investigated in 44 agencies through other mechanisms.
 - b. 7 findings of noncompliance were issued.
 - c. 7 (100%) of corrections completed as soon as possible, all within one year of identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

- A. 70 findings of noncompliance noted during the period of time from July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005. Of those noncompliant findings, 47/70 have not yet had one year to correct identified noncompliance as a number of monitoring visits were completed from February – April of 2005. These districts are implementing corrective actions and follow-up visits are in progress with these districts to determine current compliance. Of those who have had a year to correct, performance indicators indicate that 16 of 23 noncompliant findings have been corrected which represents 70% of noncompliance corrected within one year.
- B. All findings of noncompliance were identified through focused monitoring or other mechanisms in C.
- C. a. 44 LEAs were included on the complaint, due process hearing and mediation tracking logs maintained by the MDE. Some LEAs were represented more than one time on the various tracking logs, but were counted only once for each mechanism of resolution (i.e., LEA counted once if the name appeared on the complaint log two times, counted once if the name appeared on the due process hearing list twice, etc.).
 - b. 7 findings of noncompliance were issued, following investigation by the OSE.
 - c. 7 (100%) of corrections completed as soon as possible, all within one year of identification, verified by follow-up reports or site visits as necessary to determine compliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of noncompliance related to monitoring priority area and indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The MDE/OSE has developed a method of tracking LEA noncompliance which will ensure that individual findings are tracked with regard to specific issues and to ensure that the timelines for correction do not exceed one year from the time of identification. A shared file or folder has been established by the Office of Management Information Systems (MIS) and staff assigned to the monitoring division, as well as the Director of the OSE and the Bureau Director for Program will have shared access to this folder. Each individual staff member assigned to the monitoring division is responsible for ensuring that individual findings and the date for corrective actions are entered into the

system. Individual staff are then responsible for ensuring corrective actions are made no later than one year from identification. This will be monitored routinely by the Division Director of Program Evaluation and Improvement and the Bureau Director.

The MDE/OSE has implemented a number of improvement strategies or activities designed to assist LEAs effectively implement improvement plan activities. All LEAs with active improvement plans are assigned to one of three Regional Service Centers that employ technical assistance specialists. These individuals are responsible for and responsive to the needs of LEAs on corrective actions to support LEA personnel in the implementation of activities. The technical assistance specialists spend time in the district, within individual schools, attending Teacher Support Team meetings, LSC meetings, eligibility determination meetings, IEP meetings as well as other school based decision making team sessions. They attend professional development along side LEA personnel as well as provide training in specific areas of need. These individuals are expected to spend three/fourths of the work week in assigned LEAs to support their improvement plan activities.

The MDE/OSE works closely with the technical assistance specialists. Joint training opportunities and collaborative work sessions are a routine part of this endeavor. The technical assistance specialists provide quarterly reports on their activities in all assigned LEAs. There is also an informal method for providing feedback and conducting routine communication with OSE staff between the regularly scheduled quarterly report due dates. The technical assistance specialists meet quarterly with the Mattie T. consultants and the OSE staff to allow an opportunity for problem solving and collaborative planning efforts.

Feedback is routinely provided to LEAs on IPs through the OSE's review of the LEA quarterly submissions. Once the quarterly reports are received by the OSE, assigned monitoring staff review these and provide feedback to the district. Most often the feedback pertains to specific questions that must be answered by the LEA with regard to a lack of documented measurable change as a result of the LEA's implementation of IP activities. We continue to work with LEAs to ensure that they provide evidence of change, instead of reporting activities which only demonstrate LEA effort. This requires the OSE to request specific information from the LEA - increasing the number of submissions and written exchange of information between the OSE and the LEA.

The MDE will provide technical assistance to LEAs on IPs in areas of need. Feedback obtained from the TA specialists as noted above will be utilized by MDE/OSE staff in the Division of Technical Assistance to provide training in specific areas of need with regard to implementation of IP activities.

LEAs that do not evidence correction of noncompliance within one year from the time of identification, will progress through a graduated level of sanctions.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: (NOTE: Cannot be less than 100%) Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Note: Indicator 16 has been removed from the measurement table effective FFY 2011.
20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MDE/OSE through its general supervisory authority implements the Complaint Procedures under Part B of the IDEA. Organizations or individuals who believe an LEA has violated a requirement of Part B or State regulations regarding SWD may file a signed written complaint with the MDE/OSE. All written signed complaints are processed utilizing the confidentiality requirements under Section IX of the MS Policies and Procedures.

The filing date of the formal complaint is documented and the MDE/OSE notifies the LEA via phone that a complaint has been filed which indicates a violation of Part B regulations and that the Child Action Referral Form (CARF) and notification letter will be sent to the LEA.

The CARF and the initial notification letter are completed and mailed to the Superintendent and the Director of Special Education of the LEA within 10 days of receipt of the complaint and copied to the complainant. A written response is to be received by the MDE/OSE from LEA personnel within 7 days of the date the initial notification letter is received by the LEA.

Upon receipt of the LEA's written response, MDE/OSE personnel review the data and determine whether the local district has taken sufficient steps to resolve the complaint. The MDE/OSE may conduct a site visit to investigate. If the MDE/OSE finds that the district has fulfilled its obligations under IDEA, a closing letter is issued to the superintendent, director of special education, and the complainant addressing each allegation in the complaint, the findings of fact and conclusions, the reasons for the MDE/OSE's final decision and a copy of the Procedural Safeguards.

If the district has not carried out all responsibilities under IDEA, the MDE/OSE determines the necessary steps to address the issue and requires the LEA to implement corrective actions. The MDE/OSE issues a letter to the LEA specifying the problems noted, as well as solutions and timelines for correction.

If the response from LEA personnel indicates the complaint remains unresolved, a letter is sent to the LEA requesting bi-monthly reports until the complaint is resolved in accordance with timelines.

The MDE provides technical assistance as needed to ensure the district achieves compliance.

The LEA has 60 days from the date the complaint was filed to resolve the complaint unless exceptional circumstances warrant an extension. An extension that outlines specific exceptional circumstances may be requested in writing by the LEA. Exact timeline extensions are set by MDE/OSE personnel.

If after 60 days the complaint is not resolved due to a disagreement between the parties and an extension has NOT been granted, letters will be sent to the LEA as well as the complainant informing them that the only option is for either party to request in writing a due process hearing.

In the event that within 60 days of the MDE/OSE's receipt of a complaint, the LEA is clearly not implementing the solutions and timelines required in the compliance report, MDE/OSE shall notify the head of the LEA that IDEA Part B and Preschool funding will be held until such time as compliance is achieved. Hearing procedures will be followed prior to the actual withholding of funds.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

100% of complaints were resolved within the 60 day timeline.

See Part B – SPP/APR Attachment 1 – Section A for information regarding signed, written complaints.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The formal complaint log for 2004-2005 (from the period beginning July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) indicates 13 written signed complaints were received by the MDE/OSE. CARFs were issued to LEAs on all 13 written signed reports. In 2 of 13 complaints received, the parents withdrew the complaint following the MDE/OSE issuing the CARF to the LEA.

All 13 written, signed complaints were resolved within the 60-day timeline, with most of them being resolved within a 30-day timeframe.

MDE is in compliance with the requirement that complaints be resolved within the necessary timelines.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2006 (2006-2007)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2007 (2007-2008)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2008 (2008-2009)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2009 (2009-2010)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2010 (2010-2011)	100 % of parent complaints will be resolved within 60 days from receipt of written signed complaint.
2011 (2011-2012)	Indicator 16 will not be reported in FFY 2012.
2012 (2012-2013)	Indicator 16 will not be reported in FFY 2012.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MDE will engage in the following activities to ensure continued compliance with Indicator 16:

Provide support to LEAs in the form of technical assistance needed to resolve specific issues through the Division of Technical Assistance. [On-going]

Provide professional development opportunities for parents and families to ensure they are knowledgeable of their rights afforded to them through the Procedural Safeguards,

and to provide them with information regarding issues of eligibility, placement, and FAPE. [On-going]

Pursue sanctions as necessary, including the withholding of Part B IDEA and Preschool funds for LEAs and awarding of compensatory services. [On-going]

Continue to assign 2 staff persons to handle formal parent complaints and provide technical assistance to parents contacting the MDE/OSE Parent Hotline.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: (NOTE: Cannot be less than 100%) Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

Note: Indicator 17 has been removed from the measurement table effective FFY 2011.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MDE/OSE through its general supervisory authority ensures the implementation of the Impartial Due Process Hearing Procedures under Part B of the IDEA. Parents or LEA personnel may request a hearing relative to initiating or changing or the refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation or educational placement of a child or the provision of a FAPE. Upon receipt of a request for a due process hearing, the MDE/OSE appoints a hearing officer from the approved list of qualified hearing officers utilizing a rotational process for appointment. A hearing will be completed and a copy of the written decision will be mailed to each of the parties within 45 days of the date of the request for the hearing. A hearing officer may grant specific extensions of time beyond this period at the request of either party. Whenever an extension is granted, the hearing officer will issue written findings of facts and decisions within ten days after the conclusion of the hearing. Mississippi has a one-tier system; therefore, parents who disagree with the decision of the state level hearing officer may appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing were adjudicated within either the 45 day timeline or the timeline extended by the hearing officer.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For FFY 2004 (period of time beginning July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005), 15 requests were made for Due Process Hearings. Of those 15 requests, 4 actually went to a hearing and all four were conducted within either the 45 day or the extended timeline.

Please refer to Part B – SPP/APR Attachment 1 Section C for specific information on Hearing Requests.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timeline.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timeline.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timeline.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timeline.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of due process hearings will be adjudicated within required timeline.
2011 (2011-2012)	Indicator 17 will not be reported in FFY 2011.
2012 (2012-2013)	Indicator 17 will not be reported in FFY 2012.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MDE will engage in the following activities to ensure continued compliance with Indicator 17:

Analyze the reasons Due Process Hearing requests are being filed and explore ways that the MDE/OSE staff in the Division of Technical Assistance can provide additional support and technical assistance to LEAs and provide parent training based upon the analysis of this information. [On-going]

Provide professional development opportunities for parents and families to ensure they are knowledgeable of their rights afforded to them through the Procedural Safeguards, and to provide them with information regarding issues of identification, eligibility, placement, and FAPE. [On-going]

Take appropriate measures to resolve complaints whenever it is determined that an LEA is not implementing the decision of the hearing officer. [On-going]

One full-time staff member assigned to the Division of Technical Assistance coordinates the processes of mediation, due process and resolution sessions.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

New Indicator: The MDE/OSE revised its documentation form and tracking system to ensure the documentation and monitoring of due process hearing requests which were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

100% of hearing requests that went to resolutions sessions were resolved through resolution agreements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The formal due process hearing tracking system for 2005-2006 (from the period beginning July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006) indicates twenty-two requests were filed for due process hearings. Three of the twenty-two requests went to a resolution session. All three were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator
2006 (2006-2007)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.
2009	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.

(2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.
2011 (2011-2012)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.
2012 (2012-2013)	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MDE will engage in the following activities to ensure continued compliance with Indicator 18:

Analyze the reasons Due Process Hearing requests are being filed and explore ways that the MDE/OSE staff in the Division of Technical Assistance can provide additional support and technical assistance to LEAs regarding the resolution process and provide parent training based upon the analysis of this information. [On-going]

Provide professional development opportunities for parents and families to ensure they are knowledgeable of their rights afforded to them through the Procedural Safeguards, and to provide them with information regarding issues of identification, eligibility, placement, and FAPE. [On-going]

Take appropriate measures to resolve complaints whenever it is determined that an LEA is not implementing the decision of the hearing officer. [On-going]

One full-time staff member assigned to the Division of Technical Assistance coordinates the processes of mediation, due process and resolution sessions.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MDE/OSE ensures through its general supervisory authority that procedures are established and implemented to allow parents and LEA personnel to resolve disputes involving disagreements regarding the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or provision of a FAPE through the process of mediation. Mediation is available to either party before a request is made for an impartial due process hearing or after a request for an impartial due process hearing is made. It is however, a voluntary process on the part of both parties.

The MDE/OSE maintains a list of qualified mediators who are selected on a rotational basis from the list of approved, qualified mediators. The MDE/OSE bears the cost of the mediator, including travel costs and a standard fee for mediation services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

75% of mediations conducted resulted in mediation agreements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The mediation log for FFY 2004 (beginning from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) maintained by the MDE/OSE indicates that 27 mediations were requested during FFY 2004. Of the 27 mediation sessions requested, 7 were withdrawn. Of the remaining 20 requests where mediation was held, 16 or 75% resulted in mediation agreements. 3 of the 16 mediations completed, did not achieve agreement through mediation and proceeded to a due process hearing. The one remaining mediation which was a request for mediation only (mediation was not related to a request for a due process hearing) did not result in agreement; however, the parent did not pursue nor file a request for a due process hearing following the completion of mediation.

Please refer to Part B – SPP/APR Attachment 1 – Section B – Mediation Requests for specific information.

MDE and its stakeholders agree that 75% is an acceptable rate for resolution of mediation agreements and seeks to maintain the current percentage.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2006 (2006-2007)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2011 (2011-2012)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2012 (2012-2013)	75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The MDE will coordinate the annual selection of qualified individuals to serve as mediators.

The MDE will coordinate the annual training program for individuals selected to serve as mediators.

The MDE/OSE will solicit feedback from districts regarding the effect and impact of mediation services provided, and to obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the individual(s) conducting mediation for the LEA.

The MDE/OSE will explore the reasons cited for mediation requests through an analysis of the tracking system used for mediation. This information will be used to determine

any critical areas of need on a statewide basis or for determining individual targeted technical assistance with specific LEAs.

Resources:

Staff assigned to the Division of Technical Assistance:

One staff member assigned to coordinate, mediation, due process requests, formal complaints and the resolution sessions.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports).
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

MSIS began its development phase in 1999. A pilot followed with schools across the state during the 2000-2001 school year. During this time, MSIS ran parallel with the systems it was to replace (MASPRO – Monthly Attendance Summary Program, ACCRED – Personnel and Accreditation Data, MSEIE – MS Electronic Information Exchange, and VETS – Vocational Education Data Collection) to validate the data. MSIS went live during the 2001-2002 school year. A parallel year for the SPED child count occurred during the 2001-2002 school year. All child count data has come from MSIS beginning in 2002-2003 school year.

A monthly or daily file is submitted to MSIS from the school that currently owns the student to set the SPED flag to Y in MSIS. Once the SPED flag is set to Y, the school can access the student on the Student Update screen in MSIS to enter the data required for the December 1 Count (IEP and Eligibility date, Disability, teacher serving disability, related service, etc.). The student’s schedule, demographic information, discipline, etc. is submitted to MSIS in a monthly file.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

MDE did not provide 618 data by the Feb. 1, 2005 deadline

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See improvement activities

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of statewide data will be accurately reported by established deadlines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MDE experienced problems with the data system in 2004-05 and has implemented aggressive corrective measures. The State’s student level database, MSIS, is supervised by the Office of Management and Information Systems (MIS). The OSE has worked closely with MIS and the state agency responsible for oversight of electronic data systems, the Office of Information and Technology Services (ITS), to develop detailed plans and activities to ensure that data are collected and analyzed in a timely and accurate manner. ITS issued a contract with the original program developers, Third Day Solutions (TDS), to evaluate and remediate weaknesses in the MSIS components relative to special education data.

Timeline:

November, 2005 – ITS and TDS conduct a database analysis to evaluate and review SPED requirements and needs of MSIS data

November, 2005 – ITS issues contract to TDS for LRE Statement of Work

November - February, 2006 - LRE procedure code updated, run procedure, produce data, review results, produce Table 3 data, and LRE data for each school district

February, 2006 – Documentation from ITS to MIS concerning LRE procedure and necessary snapshot procedures to occur annually (copies to SPED)

February, 2006 – ITS issues contract to TDS for Intervention Statement of Work

February - June, 2006 – Intervention code and screen reviewed, updated, and tested.

June, 2006 – Documentation from ITS to MIS concerning Intervention procedure and time frames that must occur annually (copies to SPED)