

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Introduction to the State Performance Plan
(SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Executive Summary:

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

148

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Mississippi's system of general supervision is an integrated system which includes the following activities:

- 1.) Integrated Monitoring Activities (on-site monitoring, desk-audits, self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Application)
- 2.) Data (database, desk-audits)
- 3.) Policies, Procedures, and Effective implementation (self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Application)
- 4.) State Performance Plan
- 5.) Dispute Resolution (on-site investigations, desk-audits)
- 6.) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development (on-site, collaborative targeted technical assistance)
- 7.) Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions
- 8.) Fiscal management (desk audits, on-site investigations, technical assistance)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The Office of Special Education provides technical assistance, professional development opportunities, guidance and support to parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers regarding the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), State Board Policy 74.19, and research-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19, to promote access to the general education curriculum and to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

Technical assistance is provided through both informal and formal methods. Staff in the Office of Special Education provide technical assistance on an on-going daily basis through our responsiveness to phone calls and emails from parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers regarding the requirements of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19 in the provision of services, implementation of programs and protections for children and youth with disabilities. More formal methods of technical assistance include professional development delivered to individual districts following a formal request for training in a specific area(s) of need, regional training sessions scheduled across the state in identified areas of need, technical assistance that is targeted to address an identified need (systemic areas of need, priority areas identified through on-going review and analysis of data, priority areas of need as determined appropriate by the Mississippi Department of Education). Technical assistance is also provided to local school districts by reviewing local district Policies and Procedures, Individualized Education Programs, and Transition Plans to provide recommendations and feedback on the documents reviewed and analyzed.

Technical assistance needs are data-driven and evolve from many activities/sources such as on-site monitoring, desk-audits, self-assessments, LEA assurances, Project Applications, database reviews, review of local Policies and Procedures, Formal State Complaints, as well as through surveys or Needs Assessments completed by the local school districts.

The Office of Special Education has increased collaborative efforts with other MDE program offices to deliver technical assistance across offices in an effort to support general educators' capacity to instruct children with disabilities and to ensure administrators understand the requirements of implementing IDEA requirements and State Board Policy 74.19 for children with disabilities served by the local school district. Staff in the OSE has also supported training and technical assistance efforts provided by other MDE program offices in an effort to support the needs of all students as articulated through the Mississippi Department of Education's vision, mission, and Strategic Plan.

As a result of Mississippi receiving a federal determination of "needs assistance, Mississippi has received technical assistance from the following sources: the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) in the significant work that has been done in the development and implementation of Mississippi's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP); the School-wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) in a small number of school districts and using the SWIFT model/concept to support the implementation of Mississippi's SSIP; Kim Hartsill, independent contractor to provide technical assistance with monitoring efforts and activities, including general supervision activities, and the development and implementation of Mississippi's SSIP; Brustein and Manasevit regarding federal education regulations and legislative practices, specifically with funding sources and blending and braiding of federal funds; Council of Chief State School Officers SCASS groups and networking with other states and their available resources; and Art Cernosia, Esq. regarding legal issues, monitoring, and enforcement.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

All technical assistance sources have been utilized to drive decision-making at the SEA, and to inform policy, procedures, and practice at the LEA level. The guidance provided to LEAs is designed to ensure compliant practice, improve positive outcomes for children and their families, build capacity for schools and districts to scale up and out instructionally to ensure children and youth in Mississippi graduate from school prepared for college and the workforce.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) provides professional development opportunities regarding the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), State Board Policy 74.19, and research-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19. Professional development opportunities are provided to parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers and are focused on strategies designed to promote students with disabilities access to the general education curriculum and to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

The MDE has implemented a system designed to deliver professional development opportunities through collaborative efforts with multiple program offices within the agency as well as external agency collaboration. A relatively new format for deploying professional development resources is the employment of Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) and Educators in Residence (EiR). Staff employed as an EiR or a PDC have primary responsibility for the delivery of professional development within cohort groups or assigned districts, thereby providing a level of sustainability. This format ensures consistent sustainability with on-going professional development activities, guided practice, observations, and feedback. This format allows for more of a coaching or modeling process than what is traditionally provided during a training session. While the EiR or the PDC may initiate the delivery of professional development through an initial training session, there are multiple opportunities for follow-up and on-going activities following the initial training to support and enhance the ability of the school-based personnel to build capacity within the school setting and to further develop skills in identified areas of prioritized needs.

The MDE has strengthened its ability to deliver professional development through the involvement of the EiR and PDCs. This model has been highly successful as we have utilized these positions in a number of program offices under the leadership of the Chief Academic Officer. Literacy coaches have been employed in this capacity and are able to better address literacy efforts across the State in a sustained manner. Professional Development Coordinators and Educators in Residence are also employed in the Offices of Special Education, Professional Development, Student Assessment, Early Childhood, and Elementary Education. Their primary responsibility is to design and deliver professional development opportunities to educators and administrators that reflects scientifically research-based strategies and practices in an effort to build capacity for schools and districts to scale up and out instructionally to ensure children and youth in Mississippi graduate from school prepared for college and the workforce.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through presentations to the Special Education Advisory Panel and through monthly webinars with special education directors around the State. Feedback was given and considered in making final decisions regarding targets and revisions.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

LEA performance data, the SPP, and other public reporting data, is located on the State's website at the following link. http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSE/SPP_APR

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2014 (July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014) or FFY 2015 (July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.

The State's determinations for both 2016 and 2017 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2017 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State did not provide a description of the general supervision system and stakeholder involvement, as required under OSEP Memo 18-01.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			22.87%	23.37%	23.37%	63.00%	66.00%	66.00%	71.00%	71.00%	77.00%
Data			22.87%	23.16%	23.16%	19.00%	20.00%	23.00%	31.91%	22.50%	28.10%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	77.00%
Data	33.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with two stakeholder groups: the Special Education Advisory Panel and a group of special education directors from across the state. Current targets were reviewed along with Mississippi's historical performance as well as recent changes made to graduation requirements that begin in the 2018-2019 school year. Also reviewed was the goal included in Mississippi's performance plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act. This plan calls for Mississippi to have a 70% graduation rate for students with disabilities by 2025. As a result, the recommendation was made to reset Mississippi's baseline with the FFY16 graduation rate and increase targets each year by 4.4% to reach 70% by 2024-2025.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	81.00%	38.78% 86.00%	43.18% 85.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with two stakeholder groups: the Special Education Advisory Panel and a group of special education directors from across the state. Current targets were reviewed along with Mississippi's historical performance as well as recent changes made to graduation requirements that begin in the 2018-2019 school year. Also reviewed was the goal included in Mississippi's performance plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act. This plan calls for Mississippi to have a 70% graduation rate for students with disabilities by 2025. As a result, the recommendation was made to reset Mississippi's baseline with the FFY16 graduation rate and increase targets each year by 4.4% to reach 70% by 2024-2025.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

For Indicator 1, States are required to report data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, States must use data from 2015-2016.) For the 2015-2016 school year, States and LEAs were required to implement Title I of the ESEA in accordance with NCLB requirements. Changes made to Title I of the ESEA by ESSA in how the graduation rate is calculated took effect beginning with the 2017-2018 school year. States will be required to report graduation data from 2017-2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR submitted in 2020.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,130	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,258	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	34.68%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
1,130	3,258	33.60%	81.00%	34.68%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

For FFY 16 graduation data, all students were required to meet requirements for graduation as set forth by the Mississippi State Board of Education. These requirements include earning a specified number of Carnegie Units depending on the type of diploma earned. These are laid out in Appendices A-1 through A-4 (pp. 42-52) of the attached [Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2017](#) and passing scores, or acceptable equivalents as defined by the State Board of Education in Appendix A-5 (pp. 53-60) of the attached [Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2017](#). These requirements are not different for students with disabilities.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

For Indicator 1, States are required to report data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, States must use data from 2015-2016.) For the 2015-2016 school year, States and LEAs were required to implement Title I of the ESEA in accordance with NCLB requirements. Changes made to Title I of the ESEA by ESSA in how the graduation rate is calculated took effect beginning with the 2017-2018 school year. States will be required to report graduation data from 2017-2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR submitted in 2020.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and why there is a difference.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

For FFY 16 graduation data, all students were required to meet requirements for graduation as set forth by the Mississippi State Board of Education. These requirements include passing scores, or acceptable equivalents as defined by the State Board of Education in Appendix A-5 (pp. 53-60) of the attached [Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2017](#) and earning a specified number of Carnegie Units depending on the type of diploma earned. These are laid out in Appendices A-1 through A-4 (pp. 42-52) of the attached [Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2017](#). These requirements are not different for students with disabilities.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
 Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			12.74%	12.24%	12.24%	22.00%	18.00%		13.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data		16.99%	17.88%	16.76%	16.76%	24.00%	22.00%	10.77%	10.08%	9.35%	9.88%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	10.00%
Data	9.25%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

Option 1

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,179	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	1,415	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	4	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	261	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	12	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
261	2,871	9.25%	10.00%	9.09%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

DEFINITION OF A DROPOUT A dropout is an individual who: (1) Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; (2) Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; (3) Has not graduated from high school or completed a State or District approved educational program; and (4) Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: Transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or District approved educational program; temporary absence due to suspension or school approved illness; or death.

For the purpose of monthly reporting, a student who was enrolled at some point during the month, has not met one of the exclusionary conditions listed above and is no longer attending school will be reported on the monthly attendance report as a dropout.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2016 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.00%	93.80%	95.70%	99.20%	97.70%	97.50%	98.00%	96.80%	95.53%	92.20%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.00%	93.60%	95.60%	96.40%	97.60%	97.40%	97.90%	96.90%	95.46%	92.45%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	93.53%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	94.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2016 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5986	5633	4521	4725	4429	4213	0	5323	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4833	2985	2292	1964	1773	1749		2935			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	529	1935	1534	2077	1993	1757		1486			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	547	606	601	551	519	546		798			

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5986	5632	4521	4725	4429	4212	0	5323	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3105	2524	1922	1686	1529	1470		2884			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2251	2403	1904	2367	2242	2041		1501			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	548	604	603	550	520	548		777			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	34,830	34,010	93.53%	95.00%	97.65%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	34,828	33,979	94.14%	95.00%	97.56%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reporting of assessment results can be found in the following location:

<http://mdereports.mdek12.org/>

To locate a particular LEA or school report, select the LEA and/or school, change the year to 2016-2017 or prior, and click on the NCLB Report Card tab.

Additional assessment reporting that reports results of participation and performance by assessment type can be found at:
http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSE/SPP_APR

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments, as well as the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2016 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2015 2014	Target ≥			46.00%	32.30%	49.30%	49.30%	66.30%		45.00%	50.00%	55.00%
			Data		37.00%	36.40%	19.00%	16.81%	19.80%	20.00%	22.20%	24.40%	19.85%	12.08%
Math	A Overall	2015 2014	Target ≥			40.00%	35.70%	51.70%	51.70%	68.00%		50.00%	54.00%	59.00%
			Data		38.50%	37.10%	23.60%	23.59%	28.50%	29.10%	31.10%	33.80%	28.38%	11.09%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	60.00%
		Data	11.39%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	63.00%
		Data	10.81%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with two stakeholder groups: the Special Education Advisory Panel and a group of special education directors from across the state. Current targets were reviewed along with Mississippi's historical performance. It is important to note that the current targets were set based on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT-2). Mississippi participated in the PARCC Assessment during the 2014-2015 school year. Mississippi then developed its own Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) which was administered in both FFY2015 and FFY2016. Also reviewed was the goal included in Mississippi's performance plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act. This plan calls for Mississippi to have a 70% proficiency rate for students with disabilities by 2025. As a result, the recommendation was made to reset Mississippi's baseline with the FFY15 proficiency rates and increase targets each year to reach 70% by 2024-2025. For ELA that will be a yearly increase of 6.51% and for math 6.58%.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	17.90% 65.00%	24.41% 70.00%	30.92% 75.00%
	Math	17.39% 68.00%	23.97% 73.00%	30.55% 78.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with two stakeholder groups: the Special Education Advisory Panel and a group of special education directors from across the state. Current targets were reviewed along with Mississippi's historical performance. It is important to note that the current targets were set based on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT-2). Mississippi participated in the PARCC Assessment during the 2014-2015 school year. Mississippi then developed its own Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) which was administered in both FFY2015 and FFY2016. Also reviewed was the goal included in Mississippi's performance plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act. This plan calls for Mississippi to have a 70% proficiency rate for students with disabilities by 2025. As a result, the recommendation was made to reset Mississippi's baseline with the FFY15 proficiency rates and increase targets each year to reach 70% by 2024-2025. For ELA that will be a yearly increase of 6.51% and for math 6.58%.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvements activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed. On November 28, 2017, the revisions to the targets were reviewed with the Special Education Advisory Panel during a public meeting. Questions and comments from the floor were taken in addition to panel members. All targets were approved by the Panel. Additionally, on December 4, 2017, a webinar was held with special education administrators from across the State. They also approved the change in targets.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an [if applicable, adequate] explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2016 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	5909	5526	4427	4592	4285	4052	0	5219	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	837	480	397	308	178	171		276			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25	81	87	93	62	74		98			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0		0			

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	5904	5531	4429	4603	4291	4059	0	5162	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	881	556	335	244	266	172		224			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	199	138	69	108	135	94		97			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0		0			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	34,010	3,167	11.39%	17.90%	9.31%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Reasons for Group A Slippage

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	33,979	3,518	10.81%	17.39%	10.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reporting of assessment results can be found in the following location:

<http://mdereports.mdek12.org/>

To locate a particular LEA or school report, select the LEA and/or school, change the year to 2016-2017 or prior, and click on the NCLB Report Card tab.

Additional assessment reporting that reports results of participation and performance by assessment type can be found at:
http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSE/SPP_APR

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an [if applicable, adequate] explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	3.29%	1.32%	1.32%	1.32%	28.95%	12.50%	7.95%	9.93%	9.40%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	6.76%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The baseline was reset for this indicator in FFY2016 due to the change in the measurement table that requires the denominator to be the number of districts that meet the minimum n-size for analysis.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 146 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 0 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in either the FFY 2015 or FFY 2016 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State's FFY 2016 data represent slippage from the FFY 2015 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2016 target for this indicator. Although the State addressed actions it is taking that may affect performance, The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 2

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
14	146	6.76%	0%	9.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Reasons for Slippage

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) has had no major policy or legislative actions that would have impacted discipline. The MDE Office of Special Education reviewed data with stakeholders and LEAs. The MDE was unable to identify a specific cause for the increase in discipline for students with disabilities. The MDE believes that the reason for slippage is a one time event. The MDE Office of Special Education continues to provide professional development to general education and special education educators and administrators surrounding appropriate discipline regulations. In addition, in 2015 MDE released a new procedural manual with one entire volume dedicated to discipline procedures for students with disabilities.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- 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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and 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.

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 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to SWOD is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in the State database.

Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 for Indicator 4.

All districts met the minimum "n" size for Indicator 4a.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 146 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 0 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in either the FFY 2015 or FFY 2016 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State's FFY 2016 data represent slippage from the FFY 2015 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2016 target for this indicator. Although the State addressed actions it is taking that may affect performance, The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State used a minimum size requirement; all districts did meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

The State has reviewed the districts' 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 with the IDEA required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2015

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						1.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The baseline was reset for this indicator in FFY2016 due to the change in the measurement table that requires the denominator to be the number of districts that meet the minimum n-size for analysis.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 146 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 0 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in either the FFY 2015 or FFY 2016 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 2

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
32	0	146	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and 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 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 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to SWOD is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in the State database.

Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 for Indicator 4.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 146 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 0 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in either the FFY 2015 or FFY 2016 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State used a minimum size requirement; all districts did meet the State-established minimum "n" size.

The State has reviewed the districts' 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 compliance with the IDEA, required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2015.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			54.47%	55.47%	56.47%	57.47%	57.97%	58.47%	58.97%	59.47%	59.97%
		Data		54.82%	60.67%	63.19%	65.19%	66.39%	66.97%	66.25%	67.05%	67.20%	64.27%
B	2005	Target ≤			20.48%	19.48%	18.48%	17.98%	17.48%	16.98%	16.48%	15.98%	15.48%
		Data		21.88%	17.22%	14.44%	12.46%	12.11%	12.89%	13.47%	13.82%	13.33%	14.42%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.92%	1.99%	2.13%	2.09%	2.23%	2.17%	2.18%	2.25%	2.18%
		Data		1.92%	1.99%	2.13%	2.09%	2.23%	2.17%	2.18%	2.26%	2.07%	2.08%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	60.47%
	Data	63.02%
B	Target ≤	14.98%
	Data	15.10%
C	Target ≤	2.11%
	Data	2.01%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	60.97%	61.47%	61.97%
Target B ≤	14.48%	13.98%	13.48%
Target C ≤	2.04%	1.97%	1.90%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	59,479	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	37,478	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,978	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	451	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	293	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	368	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	37,478	59,479	63.02%	60.97%	63.01%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,978	59,479	15.10%	14.48%	15.09%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,112	59,479	2.01%	2.04%	1.87%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									54.75%	64.80%	64.85%
		Data								64.75%	67.22%	66.42%	65.71%
B	2011	Target ≤									25.07%	15.02%	14.97%
		Data								15.07%	14.43%	14.51%	13.52%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	64.90%
	Data	64.04%
B	Target ≤	14.92%
	Data	15.38%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.95%	65.00%	65.05%
Target B ≤	14.87%	14.82%	14.77%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,419	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,261	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,180	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	234	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	11	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,261	8,419	64.04%	64.95%	62.49%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,425	8,419	15.38%	14.87%	16.93%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for A Slippage

Multiple Head Start Agencies closed leaving some LEAs with few to no regular education early childhood options, especially those in rural areas. Many training opportunities were provided regarding how to properly choose the correct classification that matched the LRE placement, which resulted in determining that many LRESs had been applying an improper classification of the LRE placement. Additionally, Mississippi sought guidance from DaSy, the national technical assistance center funded by OSEP on how to classify children who began the school year as a five-year old. In addition, Mississippi held a data summit for district Special Education Directors and Early Childhood Coordinators to address district level data for Indicator 6. This data summit was held with support and guidance from DaSy and NCSI. Mississippi's student information system did not have a stop-gap for this error, but now does.

Reasons for B Slippage

Multiple Head Start Agencies closed leaving some LEAs with few to no regular education early childhood options, especially those in rural areas. Many training opportunities were provided regarding how to properly choose the correct classification that matched the LRE placement, which resulted in determining that many LRESs had been applying an improper classification of the LRE placement. Additionally, Mississippi sought guidance from DaSy, the national technical assistance center funded by OSEP on how to classify children who began the school year as a five-year old. In addition, Mississippi held a data summit for district Special Education Directors and Early Childhood Coordinators to address district level data for Indicator 6. This data summit was held with support and guidance from DaSy and NCSI. Mississippi's student information system did not have a stop-gap for this error, but now does.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	56.99%	58.00%
		Data					47.40%	47.00%	47.00%	48.00%	43.00%	56.99%	50.11%
A2	2013	Target ≥						81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	81.74%	83.00%
		Data					80.40%	79.00%	78.00%	79.00%	78.00%	81.74%	76.12%
B1	2013	Target ≥						50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	64.01%	65.00%
		Data					49.10%	45.00%	47.00%	51.00%	45.00%	64.01%	58.40%
B2	2013	Target ≥						69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	74.37%	75.00%
		Data					68.20%	62.00%	61.00%	65.00%	65.00%	74.37%	70.42%
C1	2013	Target ≥						39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	42.24%	43.00%
		Data					38.10%	40.00%	43.00%	40.00%	39.00%	42.24%	33.26%
C2	2013	Target ≥						77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	71.78%	73.00%
		Data					76.40%	73.00%	72.00%	74.00%	74.00%	71.78%	69.38%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	59.00%
	Data	55.64%
A2	Target ≥	84.00%
	Data	79.59%
B1	Target ≥	66.00%
	Data	61.19%
B2	Target ≥	76.00%
	Data	72.19%
C1	Target ≥	44.00%
	Data	37.41%
C2	Target ≥	74.00%
	Data	70.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
Target A2 ≥	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Target B1 ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%
Target B2 ≥	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%
Target C1 ≥	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%
Target C2 ≥	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSE on revisions, if needed.

1/5/2015 Deborah Donovan

[Visible to ED and State](#)

Baselines and Targets were reset in FFY 2013 due to a change in measurement. Previously, Mississippi evaluated children ages 3-5 on an annual basis. Beginning in FFY 2013, children were evaluated upon entry and exit in the preschool program.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1451.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	77.00	5.35%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	179.00	12.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	54.00	3.76%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	200.00	13.91%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	928.00	64.53%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	254.00	510.00	55.64%	60.00%	49.80%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1128.00	1438.00	79.59%	85.00%	78.44%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Reasons for A1 Slippage

Multiple Head Start Agencies closed leaving some LEAs with few to no regular education early childhood options, especially those in rural areas. This limited student access to typical peers. Mississippi sought guidance from DaSY, the national technical assistance center funded by OSEP on how to provide students with access to general education peers. Additionally MDE OSE has provided multiple trainings on how to correctly input entry and exit data on students using the BDI-2.

Reasons for A2 Slippage

Multiple Head Start Agencies closed leaving some LEAs with few to no regular education early childhood options, especially those in rural areas. This limited student access to typical peers. Mississippi sought guidance from DaSY, the national technical assistance center funded by OSEP on how to provide students with access to general education peers. Additionally MDE OSE has provided multiple trainings on how to correctly input entry and exit data on students using the BDI-2.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	50.00	3.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	228.00	15.71%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	122.00	8.41%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	324.00	22.33%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	727.00	50.10%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	446.00	724.00	61.19%	67.00%	61.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1051.00	1451.00	72.19%	77.00%	72.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	41.00	2.87%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	317.00	22.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	61.00	4.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	159.00	11.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	851.00	59.55%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	220.00	578.00	37.41%	45.00%	38.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1010.00	1429.00	70.68%	75.00%	70.68%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No
Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			63.46%	65.46%	67.46%	69.46%	71.46%	73.46%	75.46%	77.46%	79.46%
Data		61.46%	61.80%	63.40%	94.80%	95.90%	95.80%	96.53%	96.70%	96.89%	98.83%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	81.46%
Data	97.05%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	83.46%	85.46%	87.46%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
34272.00	35262.00	97.05%	83.46%	97.19%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	51.93%	67898.00
---	--------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The State collected data for preschool children using the same survey and data collection method. Therefore, the data was collected in the same survey and not combined.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The survey used to collect this data was password-protected and available to LEA staff only. LEA staff are trained to administer the survey to parents during on-site meetings such as IEP meetings, open houses, etc. IP addresses, survey times, and other data collected from the survey are monitored to detect any possible data anomalies or discrepancies.

MDE analyzed the survey data in comparison to all special education students to determine the representativeness of the survey results. In the area of gender, MDE found that the female group was -0.83% underrepresented and the male group was 0.83% overrepresented. In the area of race, the following races had overrepresentation: Black/African American (0.74%) and Native American (0.03%). The following races had underrepresentation: Asian (-0.05%), Hispanic/Latino (-0.25%), Two or More Races (-0.1%), and White (-0.36%).

In the area of disabilities, the following disabilities had underrepresentation: Specific Learning Disability (-0.1), Traumatic Brain Injury (-0.05), Developmentally Delayed (-1.53), Visually Impaired (-0.08), Autism (-0.95), and Deaf-Blind (-0.06). The following disabilities had overrepresentation: Orthopedic Impairment (0.06), Emotional Disability (0.8), Intellectual Disability (0.03), Other Health Impairment (0.76), Multiple Disabilities (0.1), Language/Speech Impaired (0.87), and Hearing Impaired (0.12).

No area of review had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 1%, and MDE OSE considers this to be acceptable representation of the special education population.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Submitted survey: No Collection Tool Submitted

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2016 data are from a response group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

There was no sampling used for this measure. All students were included, therefore the response group was representative of the population.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The baseline was reset for this indicator in FFY2016 due to the change in the measurement table that requires the denominator to be the number of districts that meet the minimum n-size for analysis.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

OSEP Response

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n and/or cell size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 145 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 2 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were totally excluded from the calculation. However, the State reported under the Introduction that there are 148 districts in the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 3

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	145	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Mississippi has defined “disproportionate representation” as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater for overrepresentation. Mississippi conducted data analysis to investigate disproportionate representation of students with disabilities.

The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the number of students in a 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 students with disabilities 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 students with disabilities 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:

$$(\# \text{ of Black SWD in LEA} / \# \text{ of Black Students Enrolled in LEA}) * 100$$

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

The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2016 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.

A single year of data is used in the analysis and the minimum cell and n-size is 10.

Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center (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.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n and/or cell size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 145 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 2 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were totally excluded from the calculation. However, the State reported under the Introduction that there are 148 districts in the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts that were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, **not including correction of findings**

145 Districts did not meet the minimum n size.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The baseline was reset for this indicator in FFY2016 due to the change in the measurement table that requires the denominator to be the number of districts that meet the minimum n-size for analysis.

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

OSEP Response

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n and/or cell size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 143 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 4 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were totally excluded from the calculation. However, the State reported under the Introduction that there are 148 districts in the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not describe how it made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, as required in the measurement table.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 5

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	143	0%	0%	0%

Status
Met Target

Slippage
No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Mississippi has defined "disproportionate representation" as an alternate risk ratio of identification of 4.0 or greater for overrepresentation. Mississippi conducted data analysis to investigate disproportionate representation of seven racial/ethnic groups.

The alternate risk ratio is calculated only when the number of students in 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 disability or educational environment category divided by State-level risk for comparison group for disability or educational environment category

The equation used to calculate LEA-level risk is:

· (The number of students in a specific race/ethnicity and disability category 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 students in all race/ethnicity categories excluding the race/ethnicity being examined and a specific disability category 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 in the disability category of ID, the calculation is:

$$(\# \text{ of Black ID students in LEA} / \# \text{ of Black students enrolled in LEA}) * 100$$

$$(\# \text{ of non-Black ID students in the State} / \# \text{ of non-Black students enrolled in the State}) * 100$$

The number of students in each disability and race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2012 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.

A single year of data was used and the State's minimum cell and n-size is 10.

Mississippi also reviewed the Southeast Equity Assistance Center 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 as it relates to disproportionate representation 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.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n and/or cell size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 143 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 4 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were totally excluded from the calculation. However, the State reported under the Introduction that there are 148 districts in the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not describe how it made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, as required in the measurement table.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In reporting the FFY 2016 data in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, **not including correction of findings**

143 districts met the State's minimum "n" size.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		70.92%	80.00%	92.52%	97.36%	99.03%	99.09%	99.59%	99.95%	99.91%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.74%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
10,389	10,361	99.74%	100%	99.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	28
---	----

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.

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed ranged from 2 days to 52 days. The reason for delay includes the following:

1. Staff illnesses
2. Difficulty obtaining records
3. Parents not providing sufficient information

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data for Indicator 11 were obtained from the State database, MSIS. Data were collected and analyzed for the period from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. Data for children for whom consent to conduct an initial evaluation was received during FFY 2016, but the timeline for completing the evaluation elapsed after the end of FFY 2016 were not included in the FFY 2016 data analysis and will be included in the FFY 2017 APR data collection.

Steps for data collection, determination of noncompliance, and issuance of findings:

- Step 1:** Gather data from the State database after the end of the 2016-2017 school year. All records are reviewed.
- Step 2:** Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and give them the opportunity to clarify their data and/or provide allowable exceptions.
- Step 3:** Review the responses and identify noncompliance (missed timelines that did not meet one of the allowable exceptions).
- Step 4:** Determine if LEAs with identified noncompliance have met both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.
 - **Step 4a:** Determine if the LEA has corrected original cases of noncompliance by completing the evaluations and eligibility determinations, although outside of the 60-day timeframe. (Prong 1)
 - **Step 4b:** Gather data from the State database for the 2017-2018 school year to determine if LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and has achieved 100% compliance based on the review of this updated data. (Prong 2)
- Step 5:** Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2016-2017 school year and who did not meet both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance prior to the findings being issued.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		51.00%	29.43%	91.76%	94.90%	97.30%	93.94%	97.59%	96.13%	97.54%	95.49%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	648
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	142
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	72
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	320
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	63
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	72	123	97.49%	100%	58.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	51
--	----

Reasons for Slippage

The Part C data transfer process experienced an issue due to a change of personnel in the Part C office. As a result, there was a delay in receiving the data on students. Additionally, students who had never been ruled eligible for Part C services were included in the data files therefore included in the denominator. This situation was rectified during FY16 and processes have been put in place to keep students ineligible for Part C students from populating on the Part B transfer list. Additionally, MDE has been working with DaSY staff to create written procedures and processes for the exchange of data with Part C and the LEAs.

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

Fifty-one (51) students were included in (a) but not b, c, d, e, or f. The days beyond the students' third birthday range from five (5) days to ninety-two (92) days. The reason for the delays include:

1. The district being unaware of the student
2. Unable to get information from parents
3. Staff illness

Attached PDF table (optional)

No PDF table was attached

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data for Indicator 12 were obtained from the State database, MSIS. Data was collected and analyzed for the period from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. OSE continuously works with the Lead Agency for Part C, Mississippi Department of Health (MDH) to coordinate the electronic data systems in order to collect accurate information relative to this Indicator. Daily files were submitted from MDH that allowed OSE to load the files into MSIS and run a matching procedure to determine how many students being served under Part C were now being served under Part B. The OSE was able to provide data to LEAs that included a listing of eligible students receiving services at age 3 and those children currently being served by Part C who were referred to Part B. The LEAs in turn reported to OSE the status of each student in the reports. Once all the data was reported, OSE ran a process to pull data to indicate if all the students had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Steps for data collection, determination of noncompliance, and issuance of findings:

- Step 1:** Gather data from the State database after the end of the 2016-2017 school year. All records are reviewed.
- Step 2:** Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and give them the opportunity to clarify their data and/or provide allowable exceptions.
- Step 3:** Review the responses and identify noncompliance (missed timelines that did not meet one of the allowable exceptions).

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Step 4: Determine if LEAs with identified noncompliance have met both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

- **Step 4a:** Determine if the LEA has corrected original cases of noncompliance by developing and implementing the IEP, although after the third birthday. (Prong 1)
- **Step 4b:** Gather data from the State database for the 2017-2018 school year to determine if LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and has achieved 100% compliance based on the review of this updated data. (Prong 2)

Step 5: Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2016-2017 school year and who did not meet both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance prior to the findings being issued.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						100%	99.95%	99.48%	99.89%	99.73%	99.98%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.96%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
18,520	18,533	99.96%	100%	99.93%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Mississippi OSE staff monitored the data in the Statewide student information system closely throughout the 2016-2017 school year and notified LEAs by phone when it appeared that the LEA failed to indicate compliance with Indicator 13 in the database. The OSE asked the LEA to review the IEPs in question and make appropriate updates to the database. At a specified point in time, data was collected from the student information information and any IEPs that were not marked as compliant were sent to the OSE for review by Mississippi OSE staff for compliance.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?

- Yes
- No

At what age are youth included in the data for this indicator? 14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%
		Data						24.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	23.69%	22.45%
B	2009	Target ≥							63.00%	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%
		Data						61.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	61.45%	54.96%
C	2009	Target ≥							80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%
		Data						78.00%	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	80.86%	73.85%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	36.00%
	Data	29.01%
B	Target ≥	73.00%
	Data	66.78%
C	Target ≥	90.00%
	Data	84.38%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	27.79% 38.00%	28.79% 40.00%	29.79% 42.00%
Target B ≥	67.12% 75.00%	69.12% 77.00%	69.12% 79.00%
Target C ≥	85.09% 92.00%	87.09% 94.00%	89.09% 96.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed the Mississippi State Performance Plan (SPP) with two stakeholder groups: the Special Education Advisory Panel and a group of special education directors from across the state. Current targets were reviewed along with Mississippi's historical performance as well as recent changes made to the state's assessment program and graduation requirements, that begin in the 2018-2019 school year. Also reviewed was the dissolution of the Mississippi Occupational Diploma, a diploma that has only been available to students with disabilities. As a result, the recommendation was made to reset Mississippi's baseline with the FFY16 rates for indicator 14 with annual increases of 1% for 14A, 2% for 14B, and 2% for 14C.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2515.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	699.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	989.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	188.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	264.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	699.00	2515.00	29.01%	27.79%	27.79%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1688.00	2515.00	66.78%	67.12%	67.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2140.00	2515.00	84.38%	85.09%	85.09%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Overall, MS had a 92% response rate for Indicator 14. In the areas of Gender, Race, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 1 percentage point difference in respondents and leavers for any category. In the area of Exit Type, MS saw no greater than 2 percentage points difference in respondents and leavers for any category. Based on this data, MS has determined that the FFY 2016 data is representative of the population.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as instructed by the Measurement Table. Please provide the required information.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2016 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Overall, MS had a 92% response rate for Indicator 14. In the areas of Gender, Race, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 1 percentage point difference in respondents and leavers for any category. In the area of Exit Type, MS saw no greater than 2 percentage points difference in respondents and leavers for any category. Based on this data, MS has determined that the FFY 2016 data is representative of the population.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator to make its FFY 2016 data be the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept those revisions because the State did not provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data to be the FFY 2016 data. If the State wishes OSEP to accept the FFY 2016 data as its baseline data, the State must provide an adequate explanation for revising its baseline data, such as a change in the methodology or other circumstances that would explain why the FFY 2016 data are better baseline data. Absent an explanation, OSEP will use the State's previously established baseline data for evaluating the State's progress and whether the State's FFY 2018 target(s) reflect improvement over baseline data.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as instructed by the Measurement Table. Please provide the required information.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	40.00%	100%	50.00%	66.67%	100%	42.86%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	50.00%
Data	42.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The State held less than 10 resolution sessions in FFY2016. Therefore, targets will not be provided until 10 or more resolution sessions are held in a fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	5	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data	Status	Slippage
1	5	42.86%		20.00%	Incomplete Data	Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State held less than 10 resolution sessions in FFY 2016. Therefore, targets will not be provided until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions are held.

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data		69.56%	76.10%	78.57%	76.92%	46.67%	62.50%	58.54%	86.36%	58.33%	100%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	75.00%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 panel reviewed the targets and improvement activities, and advised the OSE on revisions, if needed.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	20	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	23	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	20	23	100%	75.00%	86.96%

Status
Met Target

Slippage
No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		48.00%	53.00%	58.00%
Data	37.50%			

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	63.00%	68.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Description of Measure

Please reference our PDF

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference our PDF

Overview

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Please reference our PDF

Description

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please reference our PDF

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please reference our PDF

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please reference our PDF

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please reference our PDF

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see attached PDF

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see attached PDF

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see attached PDF

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see attached PDF

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

Please see attached PDF

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see attached PDF

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Gretchen Cagle

Title: State Director of Special Education

Email: gcagle@mdek12.org

Phone: 601-359-3498