

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Mississippi**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

152

#### 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 including on-site monitoring, desk audits, LEA self-assessments, LEA assurances;
- 2.) Data submissions to the SEA via Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS);
- 3.) Policies, procedures and effective implementation reviews;
- 4.) State Performance Plan and annual LEA Determinations;
- 5.) Dispute resolution via on-site investigations and desk audits;
- 6.) Targeted technical assistance and professional development through on-site visits, webinars and coaching;
- 7.) Fiscal management via on-site investigations, desk audits and technical assistance.

#### 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 (OSE) 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), Mississippi State Board of Education Policy 74.19, and evidence-based practices in an effort to ensure implementation of the mandates of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19 and two promote access to the general education curriculum as we work toward continued improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities. technical assistance is provided through informal and formal methods. OSE staff provide technical assistance on a daily basis through responsiveness to phone calls and emails from parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers as well as weekly virtual office hours with special education directors regarding the requirements of IDEA, state Board Policy 74.19, the provision of services, implementation of programs, and protections for students 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. Technical assistance is also provided via OSE guidance and FAQ documents. Areas of need are identified at the State and local level through on-going review and analysis of data, collaboration with the Office of school Improvement, and the implementation and evaluation of progress toward the MDE Strategic Goals. 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 evolves from many activities/sources including but not limited to on-site monitoring, desk audits, self-assessments, funding application review, data submissions, LEA policy and procedure reviews, programatic and fiscal risk based assessments and Formal State Complaints. Technical assistance needs are also identified through surveys or needs assessments completed by LEAs.

The OSE continues to increase collaborative efforts with other MDE program offices to deliver technical assistance across offices in an effort to support general educators' capacity to provide effective instruction to students with disabilities to ensure administrators understand the requirements of IDEA and State Board Policy 74.19. OSE staff have 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 in MDE's vision, mission, and strategic plan.

Technical assistance is provided through informal and formal methods. Staff in the Office of Special Education provide technical assistance on a daily basis through responsiveness to phone calls and emails from parents, administrators, teachers, and related service providers as well as weekly virtual office hours with special education directors regarding the requirements of IDEA and state Board Policy 74.19 and the provision of services, implementation of programs and protections for students with disabilities. More formal methods of technical assistance include professional development delivered to individual LEAs following formal request for training in a specific area(s) of, regional training sessions scheduled across the State in identified areas of need, targeted technical assistance that address an identified area(s) of need. Technical assistance is also provided via guidance documents and FAQ documents. Areas of need are identified at the State and local level through on-going review and analysis of data, collaboration with the Office of School Improvement and the implementation of the MDE Strategic Goals. Technical assistance is also provided to LEAs by reviewing LEA 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 including but not limited on-site monitoring, desk audits, self-assessments, funding application review, data submissions, LEA policy and procedure reviews, programatic and fiscal risk based assessments and Formal State Complaints. Technical assistance needs are identified through surveys or needs assessments completed by LEAs.

The MDE OSE has worked with the following technical assistance centers. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Data Center (IDEA) Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), Brustein and Manasevit, The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) State Collaboratives, WestEd, The Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center (CEEDAR Center) and The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). Based on collaborative work with each of these national technical assistance centers and organizations the MDE OSE has continued to strengthen its programmatic and fiscal monitoring systems to include results-based accountability and the implementation of a risk-based assessment. The MDE OSE has also worked with these centers to continue developing and implementing internal practices, procedures, and timelines. The MDE OSE has worked with DaSY to develop guidelines and practices for the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) and as a result of that work, began the implementation of the COS Process in July 2021. Through work with the CEEDAR Center, the MDE OSE has developed and

piloted a Special Education Teacher mentoring program. Through work with NCSI, the MDE OSE has continued work to collaboratively with offices within the MDE Agency, particularly the MDE Office of School Improvement to improve outcomes for children and their families. The MDE OSE has worked extensively with WestEd, IDC, and CIFR to develop significant disproportionality guidance and CEIS guidance for LEAs in order to build capacity at the LEA level.

#### **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 children 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 evidence-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 providing 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. The 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 Office of Special Education. Professional Development, Statement 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 or the workforce.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

##### **The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

150

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

##### **Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised when needed and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

#### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

##### **The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

A breakout session was conducted during the MDE OSE's annual statewide Building Partnerships, Working Together Parent Conference where parents were involved and able to voice their concerns and recommendations for the SiMR.

In person focus groups were held in regional LEAs to allow district and parent representations an opportunity to provide collaborative input. This also allowed them to advise on the reasonableness of the SiMR.

During the full State Performance Plan Stakeholder focus groups were held, the SSIP team obtained feedback and input in regards to the SiMR.

During MDE OSE's Virtual Office Hours, feedback was received from the State's Special Education Directors relevant to the proposed SiMR setting. Meetings were held via zoom for the Special Education Advisory Panel, and information was shared in order to obtain feedback and address any concerns around changes to the SiMR.

Additionally, the MDE held a series of eight regional literacy meeting across the State for families of students in kindergarten through third grade. At each meeting, families received an overview of the State law concerning literacy and assessment, as well as strategies that can be used at home to help students improve their reading skill. The State Law, known as the Literacy-Based Promotion Act (LBPA), focuses on prevention and intervention to help children develop the reading skills required for long term success.

To increase the capacity of diverse groups, moving forward and planned for the 2022-2023 school year, the SSIP literacy coaches will hold additional Literacy Family Nights to provide training and resources to parents on how they can help their students at home in an effort to increase parental involvement and student outcomes.

The MDE OSE provides continuous support to LEAs and parents through the MDE OSE, Bureau Parent Engagement. The Bureau of Parent Engagement hosts an annual Parent conference in a face to face setting and virtually. This Conference provides parents with speakers that discuss strategies and supports for working with students with disabilities. This conference also provides an opportunity for parents to provide feedback to the OSE. Additionally, the MDE OSE has released the Family Guide to Special Education. The series has a guide dedicated to each IDEA eligibility category. The MDE OSE maintains a resource page for parents that can be found at: <https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/Information-for-Families/Resources>.

### **Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Stakeholder engagement meetings to solicit feedback were conducted throughout the 2020-2021 and the 2021-2022 school year. All meetings were advertised on LEA websites, MDE OSE website, and through listserves and public announcements.

### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

LEA performance data, the SPP, and other public reporting data is located on the MDE website at the following link:  
[https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/SPP\\_APR](https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/SPP_APR)

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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 mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

The State did not provide a description of the mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public. With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must provide a description of the mechanism and timelines for making the results of the stakeholder engagement in target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	42.15%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	77.00%	81.00%	38.78%	43.18%	43.18%
Data	33.60%	34.68%	36.39%	38.37%	42.15%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 1 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 1, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 1 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 graduation data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. The graduation data for FFY2020 represents a school year in which many graduation requirements were waived. FFY2019 baseline data was calculated using a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,039
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	804
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	6
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	264

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,039	3,113	42.15%	60.00%	65.50%	Met target	N/A

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

For FFY 20 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 of the Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2020. This requirements are not different for studentenst with disabilities. MississippiPublic School Accountability Standards 2019 can be found at [https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ms\\_public\\_accountability\\_standards\\_2020\\_6-15-21.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ms_public_accountability_standards_2020_6-15-21.pdf)

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 graduation data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. The graduation data for FFY2020 represents a school year in which many graduation requirements were waived. FFY2019 baseline data was calculated using a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	10.77%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data	9.25%	9.09%	9.72%	11.10%	13.05%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement.

Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 2 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 2, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 2 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets remained the same and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,039
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	804
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	6
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	264

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
264	3,113	13.05%	10.00%	8.48%	Met target	No Slippage

**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 point 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 LEA 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 LEA approved educational Programs; temporary absence due to suspension or school approved illness or death.

For the purpose monthly reporting, a student who awarded 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? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**2 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY20	95.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY20	92.09%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY20	96.97%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY20	95.44%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY20	91.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY20	96.00%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 3 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 3, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 3 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Stakeholders specifically reviewed historical data that indicated prior to impacts caused by COVID-19 Mississippi's overall assessment participation rate was over 95%. Based on stakeholder feedback, targets were set for FFY20-FFY25 with the understanding that these targets may need to be revisited.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,524	4,930	4,090
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,036	360	229
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,792	3,717	3,151
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	448	463	586

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,524	4,930	5,095
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,034	345	722
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,793	3,723	3,792
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	445	463	377

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,276	5,524		97.00%	95.51%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,540	4,930		97.00%	92.09%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,966	4,090		97.00%	96.97%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,272	5,524		97.00%	95.44%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,531	4,930		97.00%	91.91%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,891	5,095		97.00%	96.00%	N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

[https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment\\_2020-21\\_participation.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment_2020-21_participation.pdf)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3A - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 C.F.R. § 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 at the State, district and school levels. Additionally, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

**3A - Required Actions**

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY20	16.22%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY20	8.19%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY20	7.78%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY20	15.12%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY20	8.58%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY20	7.42%

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	18.00%	20.00%	23.00%	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.00%	13.00%	16.00%	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.00%	13.00%	16.00%	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	17.00%	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%	25.00%	25.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 3B data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of

Indicator 3B, FFY20 data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 3B and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Stakeholders specifically discussed the fact that the disruption in traditional learning caused by COVID-19 greatly impacted student proficiency rates. Based on stakeholder feedback, targets were set for FFY20-FFY25 with the understanding that these targets may need to be revisited as we continue to identify COVID-19 impacts on instruction and assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	4,828	4,077	3,380
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	413	86	42
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	370	248	221

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	4,827	4,068	4,514
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	377	80	107
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	353	269	228

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	783	4,828		18.00%	16.22%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	334	4,077		10.00%	8.19%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	263	3,380		10.00%	7.78%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	730	4,827		17.00%	15.12%	N/A	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	349	4,068		10.00%	8.58%	N/A	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	335	4,514		10.00%	7.42%	N/A	N/A

### **Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

[https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment\\_2020-21\\_alternate\\_proficiency.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment_2020-21_alternate_proficiency.pdf)

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 C.F.R. § 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, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

### **3B - Required Actions**

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY20	34.15%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY20	48.38%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY20	52.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY20	36.63%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY20	41.68%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY20	31.03%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	35.00%	37.00%	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%



**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 3C data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 3C, FFY18 and FFY20 data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 3C and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Stakeholders specifically discussed the fact that the disruption in traditional learning caused by COVID-19 greatly impacted student proficiency rates. Based on stakeholder feedback, targets were set for FFY20-FFY25 with the understanding that these targets may need to be revisited as we continue to identify COVID-19 impacts on instruction and assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	448	463	586
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	153	224	306

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	445	463	377
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	163	193	117

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	153	448		35.00%	34.15%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	224	463		50.00%	48.38%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	306	586		50.00%	52.22%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	163	445		40.00%	36.63%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	193	463		45.00%	41.68%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	117	377		30.00%	31.03%	N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

[https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment\\_2020-21\\_alternate\\_proficiency.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/assessment_2020-21_alternate_proficiency.pdf)

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on the OSEP response, MDE OSE updated the baseline data to reflect the FFY20 data. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 C.F.R. § 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 alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

**3C - Required Actions**

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY20	20.99
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY20	27.44
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY20	27.01
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY20	18.11
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY20	25.68
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY20	25.72

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	19.00	17.00	15.00	13.00	11.00	9.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	16.00	14.00	12.00	10.00	8.00	6.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00	15.00

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 3D data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 3D, FFY20 data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 3D and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Stakeholders specifically discussed the fact that the disruption in traditional learning caused by COVID-19 greatly impacted student proficiency rates and likely increased proficiency gaps. Based on stakeholder feedback, targets were set for FFY20-FFY25 with the understanding that these targets may need to be revisited as we continue to identify COVID-19 impacts on instruction and assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	33,220	35,532	32,142
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,828	4,077	3,380
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,609	12,129	10,797
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	753	519	387
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	413	86	42
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	370	248	221

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	33,148	35,437	37,410
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,827	4,068	4,514
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,252	11,603	11,949
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	765	537	448
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	377	80	107
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	353	269	228

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.22%	37.21%		19.00	20.99	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.19%	35.60%		25.00	27.40	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.78%	34.80%		25.00	27.01	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.12%	33.24%		16.00	18.11	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.58%	34.26%		25.00	25.68	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.42%	33.14%		25.00	25.72	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on the OSEP response, MDE OSE updated the baseline data to reflect the FFY20 data. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020. OSEP accepts the baselines for 4th Grade Reading, HS Reading, 4th Grade Math, 8th Grade Math, and HS Math. OSEP cannot accept the baseline for 8th Grade Reading because the State's FFY 2020 baseline data reported in the Historical Data table is not consistent with the State's FFY 2020 data reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data table.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets for 4th Grade Reading, HS Reading, 4th Grade Math, 8th Grade Math, and HS Math. OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for 8th Grade Reading because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above.

**3D - Required Actions**

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must establish a baseline for 8th Grade Reading with accurate data and ensure its FFY 2025 target for 8th Grade Reading reflects improvement.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	9.59%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	6.76%	9.59%	4.76%	4.70%	10.27%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 4A data to review baseline data. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 4A, historical data for Indicator 4A and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the baseline data and determine if the FFY16 baseline data were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE will continue to use the FFY16 baseline data.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

5

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
17	141	10.27%	0.00%	12.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Based on on-site monitoring and formal state complaints it is clear that to the MDE OSE that LEAs continue to require additional guidance and clarification regarding suspensions/expulsions. Specifically LEAs require guidance /clarification regarding the circumstances surrounding suspensions/expulsions. Through trainings, webinars, coaching and biweekly virtual off hour meetings, and technical assistance provided via phone calls and emails, the MDE OSE continues to provide this guidance/clarification to LEAs. In the area of positive behavioral interventions and the collection of this data. The MDE OSE has hired a professional development coordinator in the area of positive behavioral supports and interventions to provide coaching and training to LEA special education directors and teachers. The MDE OSE is also in the process of creating an Office of Student Supports and Improvements that will employ specialists to provide technical assistance and support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. These specialists will provide training, coaching, and supports to subject area teachers. By improving instructional supports to students, the MDE OSE hopes to see a decrease in behavioral disruptions that lead to suspensions and expulsions. Finally the MDE OSE in conjunction with other MDE offices, has created and begun to implement K-12 Social Emotional Learning Standards in all LEAs.

**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

**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 suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities. 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. 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, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). The data pertaining to students with disabilities is taken from the 618 data collection, also reported to ED Facts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to students without disabilities is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and the discipline records in MSIS.

Mississippi used a minimum "n" size of 10 students with disabilities for Indicator 4. 5 districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum n/cell size.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on OSEP response, MDE updated the overall district number to reflect the total number of districts from FFY2019. The State reports that 141 districts met the minimum n size requirement and 5 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies practices or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies practices and procedures and provides evidence to support the the LEA's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, practices or procedures. The OSE provides a check list which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. a completed checklist must submitted with the LEA response. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate polices, practices or procedures contributed to a significant discrepancy, a find of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification

The LEA identified 17 districts as having significant discrepancy in FFY20 based on FFY19 discipline data. Each LEA identified was required to review the LEA's policy, practices, and procedures 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 20 based on FFY19 discipline data. LEAs submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures 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. The MDE OSE reviewed each LEA's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate polices, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	15	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Each of the 15 LEAs was required to submit a verification of a review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures using a checklist provided by the MDE OSE and a review of discipline data. The MDE OSE reviewed each of the 15 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate polices, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

Each of the 15 LEAs were required to review discipline data for all students with IEPs with suspensions/expulsions of 10 days or more and provide verification of that review to SharePoint. These reviews were verified by the MDE OSE. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases on noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**4A - Required Actions**

The State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2020 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019. When reporting on the correction of this



noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

11

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	135	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 suspended and expelled at least 2 percentage points greater than the rate of suspension and expulsion for students without disabilities. Mississippi uses the following comparison methodology define 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 from a racial/ethnic group in each LEA compared to the rates for non disabled children in the same LEA. When significant discrepancy is determined for an LEA, The MDE OSE will require the LEA to conduct self-review of policies, practices, and procedures to determine if the contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Data on suspensions and expulsions is gathered from the State data base, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). The data pertaining to students with disabilities taken from the 618 data collection, also reported to EDFacts in the Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions file submission. The data pertaining to students without disabilities is taken from the net membership enrollment numbers and discipline records in MSIS.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

MDE updated the overall district number to reflect the total number of districts from FFY2019. The State reports that 135 districts met the minimum n size requirement and 11 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies practices or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy.

The LEA must provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies practices and procedures and provides evidence to support the the LEA's determination that the significant discrepancy was or was not the result of inappropriate policies, practices or procedures. The OSE provides a check list which includes a list of various types of information the LEA must review to make its determination. a completed checklist must submitted with the LEA response. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate polices, practices or procedures contributed to a significant discrepancy, a find of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA. The LEA is expected to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification

The LEA identified 17 districts as having significant discrepancy in FFY20 based on FFY19 discipline data. Each LEA identified was required to review the LEA's policy, practices, and procedures 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 20 based on FFY19 discipline data. LEAs submitted verification to the MDE OSE of its review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures 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. The MDE OSE reviewed each LEA's verification. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate polices, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Each of the 29 LEAs was required to submit a verification of a review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures using a checklist provided by the MDE OSE and a review of discipline data. The MDE OSE reviewed each of the 29 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate polices, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

Each of the 29 LEAs were required to review discipline data for all students with IEPs with suspensions/expulsions of 10 days or more and provide verification of that review to SharePoint. These reviews were verified by the MDE OSE. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases on noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**4B- Required Actions**

The State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2020 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	60.47%	60.97%	61.47%	61.97%	61.97%
A	77.52%	Data	63.02%	63.01%	65.28%	70.27%	76.42%
B	2020	Target <=	14.98%	14.48%	13.98%	13.48%	13.48%
B	11.47%	Data	15.10%	15.09%	13.89%	12.22%	11.22%
C	2020	Target <=	2.11%	2.04%	1.97%	1.90%	1.90%
C	1.70%	Data	2.01%	1.87%	1.92%	1.88%	1.90%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%
Target B <=	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 5 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 5, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 5 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	63,248
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49,030
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,256
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	568
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	126
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	380

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49,030	63,248	76.42%	77.00%	77.52%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,256	63,248	11.22%	13.00%	11.47%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,074	63,248	1.90%	1.00%	1.70%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on the OSEP response, MDE OSE updated the baseline data to reflect the FFY20 data. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	64.90%	64.95%	65.00%	65.05%	65.05%
A	Data	64.04%	62.49%	58.42%	59.16%	59.58%
B	Target <=	14.92%	14.87%	14.82%	14.77%	14.77%
B	Data	15.38%	16.93%	17.32%	16.27%	16.65%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 6 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 6, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 6 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

#### Targets



Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

**Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)**

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	45.04%
B	2020	24.96%
C	2020	0.95%

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target B <=	16.00%	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	948	2,297	669	3,914
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	311	1,103	349	1,763
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	236	446	129	811
b2. Number of children attending separate school	37	103	25	165
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	1	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	13	18	6	37

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	1,763	3,914	59.58%	60.00%	45.04%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	977	3,914	16.65%	16.00%	24.96%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	37	3,914		1.00%	0.95%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on the OSEP response, MDE OSE updated the baseline data to reflect the FFY20 data. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for Indicator 6A and Indicator 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State established baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2013	Target >=	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	62.00%
A1	56.99%	Data	55.64%	49.80%	48.25%	47.30%	50.00%
A2	2013	Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%

A2	81.74%	Data	79.59%	78.44%	75.40%	76.58%	77.78%
B1	2013	Target >=	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	69.00%
B1	64.01%	Data	61.19%	61.60%	53.54%	60.98%	60.82%
B2	2013	Target >=	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	79.00%
B2	74.37%	Data	72.19%	72.43%	67.45%	70.83%	71.21%
C1	2013	Target >=	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	47.00%
C1	42.24%	Data	37.41%	38.06%	32.94%	40.05%	39.47%
C2	2013	Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	77.00%
C2	71.78%	Data	70.68%	70.68%	64.90%	69.57%	70.72%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
Target A2 >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B1 >=	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
Target B2 >=	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
Target C1 >=	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
Target C2 >=	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 7 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 7, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 7 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Stakeholders were also advised that the FFY20 SPP is the last year the MDE OSE will be using the current data collection method for Indicator 7. The FFY21 SPP will report Indicator 7 data collected using the Child Outcomes Summary Process Based on stakeholder feedback, MDE OSE will continue to use FFY19 targets for FFY20. Once a full year of Indicator 7 data has been collected using the COS process, stakeholders will reconvene to review the data and set new targets for Indicator 7 as needed.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	58	4.22%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	206	15.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	68	4.95%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	198	14.42%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	843	61.40%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	266	530	50.00%	62.00%	50.19%	Did not meet target	No 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,041	1,373	77.78%	87.00%	75.82%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	17	1.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	299	21.78%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	116	8.45%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	287	20.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	654	47.63%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	403	719	60.82%	69.00%	56.05%	Did not meet target	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	941	1,373	71.21%	79.00%	68.54%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	22	1.60%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	362	26.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	75	5.46%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	145	10.56%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	769	56.01%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	220	604	39.47%	47.00%	36.42%	Did not meet target	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	914	1,373	70.72%	77.00%	66.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Slippage can be contributed to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to school closures, limited access to students in early childhood programs due to health and safety concerns and virtual/hybrid instruction, instruction for students was greatly impacted.
B1	Slippage can be contributed to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to school closures, limited access to students in early childhood programs due to health and safety concerns and virtual/hybrid instruction, instruction for students was greatly impacted.
B2	Slippage can be contributed to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to school closures, limited access to students in early childhood programs due to health and safety concerns and virtual/hybrid instruction, instruction for students was greatly impacted.
C1	Slippage can be contributed to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to school closures, limited access to students in early childhood programs due to health and safety concerns and virtual/hybrid instruction, instruction for students was greatly impacted.
C2	Slippage can be contributed to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to school closures, limited access to students in early childhood programs due to health and safety concerns and virtual/hybrid instruction, instruction for students was greatly impacted.

**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/no)**

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

For the MAPS report, children were placed in categories 1=7 based on the z-score for the outcome area. Each raw score was assigned a corresponding z-score. These z-scores ranges were obtained from the guidelines posted on ECO’s website on July 5, 2006. This document was titled "ECO Recommendations on Age-Expected Functioning and 2006 ECO Scale Points". The State is using the ECO Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF).

For the MAPS OSEP Outcome Report, children were placed in categories 1-5 (progress categories a-e in the measurement) based on their performance at Time 1 and Time 2. The category descriptions were taken from ECO Center’s website.

The State Defines “comparable to same-aged peers as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COSF.

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

The Battle Developmental Inventor 2nd Edition (BDI-2) is a comprehensive assessment that is designed for children from birth through seven years. It was specifically developed for identification of children who may benefit from special services, ongoing progress monitoring, and outcomes assessments. The BDI-2 domains align to the 2 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) as follows:

ECO Outcome BDI-2 domain

Positive social-emotional skills

persona-social (including social relationships)

Acquiring and using knowledge and skills

Communications and cognitive

Taking appropriate action to meet needs  
Adaptive and motor

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Beginning July 1, 2021, the MDE OSE began implementing the Childhood Outcomes Summary Process, and will report on this change in data collection for Indicator 7 in the FFY21 SPP.

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not report on the number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed.

**7 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who were assessed, as required by the measurement table.

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

### 8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 8 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 8, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 8 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. MDE OSE provided the following explanation: Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 parent survey data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. Due to health and safety concerns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic LEAs had difficulty meeting with and getting survey data from parents. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator.

#### Historical Data



Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	96.47%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	81.46%	83.46%	85.46%	87.46%	87.46%
Data	97.05%	97.19%	97.23%	97.31%	96.47%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
23,515	24,391	96.47%	97.00%	96.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

67,162

**Percentage of respondent parents**

36.32%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	24.17%	36.32%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The survey used to collect this data are available to LEA staff only. LEA staff are trained to administer the survey to parents during on-site and virtual 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. In order to increase the response rate the MDE OSE sends weekly updates beginning in April to the special education director of each LEA. These updates provide directors with the percentage of participation for each district. Another step that has been taken to increase response rate is to allow the survey to be administered in multiple formats. LEAs can provide hard copies of the survey, verbally administer the survey or provide parents with the link to the survey online. These steps will continue to be implemented.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

The MDE OSE did not identify any nonresponse bias. The MDE OSE will continue to distribute the Parent Survey to LEA staff and allow multiple formats for parents to access the survey. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to the survey and work toward having all parents complete the survey, the MDE OSE is confident that the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents and will continue to do so.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

In the area of gender, MDE found that the male group was underrepresented(-0.55% ) and the female group was overrepresented (0.55%).

In the area of race, the following races had underrepresentation:

- Asian (-0.14%),
- Black/African American (-0.15%),
- Hispanic/Latino (-0.48%), and
- Two or More Races (-0.82%).

The following races had overrepresentation:  
 Pacific Islander(0.01), and  
 White (1.47%).

In the area of disabilities, the following disabilities had underrepresentation:  
 Emotional Disability (-1.3%),  
 Hearing Impaired (-0.2%),  
 Other Health Impairment (-3.6%), and  
 Specific Learning Disability (-0.8%).

The following disabilities had overrepresentation:  
 Autism (1.1%),  
 Deaf-Blind (0.1%)  
 Developmentally Delayed (1.9%),  
 Intellectual Disability (0.1%),  
 Language/Speech Impaired (0.46%),  
 Multiple Disabilities (0.1%), and  
 Visually Impaired (0.1%).

No area of review had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3%, and MDE OSE considers this to be acceptable representation of the special education population.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

MDE OSE provided the following explanation: Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 parent survey data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. Due to health and safety concerns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic LEAs had difficulty meeting with and getting survey data from parents. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

7

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	145	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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 : 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 risks:

(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 ) times 100

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

$(\# \text{ of Non-black students with disabilities in the state} / \# \text{ of Non-Black students enrolled in the State}) * 100$

The number of students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2020 Child Count Data, also known as 618 Table 1 data. The enrollment numbers are taken from the Month 1 Net Membership data in the State database, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS). As single year of data issued in the analysis and the minimum cell and n-size is 10. Seven (7) districts did not meet the "n" size and were excluded from the calculation.

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 groups representation in the population, all groups should be represented in proportion to the make-up of the population being considered. The determination of non compliance is a two-step process. First each LEA's data is examined to disproportionate representations identified in the population of students. The second step is to determine whether or no the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Noncompliance is only existent when inappropriate identification is the case 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.

LEAs identified with disproportionality must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, practices, and/or procedures contributed to the disproportionality. Whenever it is determined that disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the LEA.

For the one LEA identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, MDE required the district to provide written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, practices and procedures, and provides evidence to support the LEA's determination that the disproportionality was or was not the result of inappropriate identification. The OSE has provides a self-assessment for disproportionality which includes a list of various types of information the district must review to make its determination. The completed assessment must be included in the LEA's response.

Based on its review of the data submitted in the self-assessment, MDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

#### FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The MDE OSE provided the following explanation. The MDE OSE reviewed the 1 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs

implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected**

The MDE OSE provided the following explanation. The MDE OSE reviewed the 1 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate polices, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral intervenes in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State's FFY 2019 data for this indicator indicated that there was no noncompliance (0%). However, the State reported in the correction table that twelve findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely fashion, but did not report that the State ensured, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that each LEA: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State must explain the discrepancy.

If the State confirms noncompliance in FFY 2019, OSEP notes that the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that the LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 in both prongs: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**9 - Required Actions**

The State's FFY 2019 data reflected 100% compliance, but the State reported that it identified and corrected one finding of noncompliance. If noncompliance was identified in FFY 2019, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

7

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13		145	0.00%	0%		N/A	N/A

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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).**

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:

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

The number of students in each disability and race/ethnicity category is taken from the December 1, 2019 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. Five districts did not meet the minimum “n” size and were excluded from the calculation. 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.**

Districts identified with disproportionality must conduct a review to determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices contributed to the disproportionality. Whenever it is determined that disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification, a finding of noncompliance will be issued to the district.

For each of the 13 districts, MDE required the district to provide a written response to the OSE that documents its review of policies, procedures, and practices and provides evidence to support the district’s determination that the disproportionality was or was not the result of inappropriate identification. The OSE has provides a self-assessment for disproportionality which includes a list of various types of information the district must review to make its determination. This completed self-assessment must be included in the district’s response.

Based on its review of the data submitted in the self assessment, MDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE provided the following explanation. The MDE OSE reviewed the 12 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral interventions in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

The MDE OSE provided the following explanation. The MDE OSE reviewed the 12 LEA's verification submitted to MDE OSE via SharePoint. The MDE OSE verified that the identified significant discrepancy in each district was not due to inappropriate policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral interventions in and procedural safeguards in compliance with IDEA. The MDE further used the Mississippi State Identification System to confirm implementation of regulatory requirements and the correction of individual cases of noncompliance

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State's FFY 2019 data for this indicator indicated that there was no noncompliance (0%). However, the State reported in the correction table that twelve findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely fashion, but did not report that the State ensured, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that each LEA: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State must explain the discrepancy.

If the State confirms noncompliance in FFY 2019, OSEP notes that the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that the LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 in both prongs: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**10 - Required Actions**

The State did not provide data for FFY 2020; therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State's FFY 2020 data are valid and reliable. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State's FFY 2019 data reflected 100% compliance, but the State reported that it identified and corrected twelve findings of noncompliance. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must provide an explanation of the discrepancy. If noncompliance was identified in FFY 2019, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.



## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.92%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.74%	99.73%	99.96%	99.95%	98.08%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7,858	7,833	98.08%	100%	99.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

25

**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 \*1 days to 127\* days. The reasons for the delays includes the following:

1. Staff delays due to absences or turnover
2. Difficulty obtaining records
3. Parents not providing sufficient information
4. Due to health and safety concerns related to COVID-19, there were school and classroom closures throughout the school year.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

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, 2020 to June 30, 2021. Data for children for whom consent to conduct an initial evaluation was received during FFY 2019, but the timeline for completing the evaluation elapsed after the end of FFY 2020 were not included in the FFY 2020 data analysis and will be included in the FFY 2021 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 2020-2021 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, prior to the finding being issued (Prong 1) and has subsequent data, obtained from the LEA or through MSIS, demonstrating ongoing compliance (Prong 2).

Step 5: Issue findings to those LEAs who were identified with noncompliance for the 2020-2021 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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to conduct monthly reviews of Indicator data for each LEA identified as noncompliant. A review of this updated data showed that all evaluation timelines were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of eligibility determination and/or IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and assessment team reports to the MDE OSE via SharePoint. MDE OSE reviewed the eligibility reports and additional supporting documentation (IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and Assessment Team reports) for each of the students to verify that even though the eligibility determination was beyond the 60 day timeline, eligibility had been determined by the LEA and noncompliance corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and eligibility could not be determined by the LEA, the LEA had to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	5	5	0
FFY 2017	4	4	0
FFY 2016	28	28	0

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to conduct monthly reviews of Indicator data for each LEA identified as noncompliant. A review of this updated data showed that all evaluation timelines were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of eligibility determination and/or IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and assessment team reports to the MDE OSE via SharePoint. MDE OSE reviewed the eligibility reports and additional supporting documentation (IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and Assessment Team reports) for each of the students to verify that even though the eligibility determination was beyond the 60 day timeline, eligibility had been determined by the LEA and noncompliance corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and eligibility could not be determined by the LEA, the LEA had to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to conduct monthly reviews of Indicator data for each LEA identified as noncompliant. A review of this updated data showed that all evaluation timelines were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of eligibility determination and/or IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and assessment team reports to the MDE OSE via SharePoint. MDE OSE reviewed the eligibility reports and additional supporting documentation (IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and Assessment Team reports) for each of the students to verify that even though the eligibility determination was beyond the 60 day timeline, eligibility had been determined by the LEA and noncompliance corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and eligibility could not be determined by the LEA, the LEA had to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to conduct monthly reviews of Indicator data for each LEA identified as noncompliant. A review of this updated data showed that all evaluation timelines were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of eligibility determination and/or IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and assessment team reports to the MDE OSE via SharePoint. MDE OSE reviewed the eligibility reports and additional supporting documentation (IEPs, Prior Written Notices, and Assessment Team reports) for each of the students to verify that even though the eligibility determination was beyond the 60 day timeline, eligibility had been determined by the LEA and noncompliance corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and eligibility could not be determined by the LEA, the LEA had to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining five uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, and 28 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, FFY 2017, and FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**11 - OSEP Response**

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	51.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.49%	58.54%	89.50%	95.20%	80.53%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,090
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	71

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	581
d. Number 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.	351
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	2
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	581	666	80.53%	100%	87.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**  
85

**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.**

Eighty-five (148) students were included in (a) but not b, c, d, e, or f. The days beyond the students' third birthday range from two (2) days to two hundred sixty-two (262) days. The reason for the delays include:

1. The district being unaware of the student
2. Unable to get information from parents
3. School closures due to COVID-19

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

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, 2020 to June 30, 2021. 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 2020-2021 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 already 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 2020-2021 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 2020-2021 school year and who did not meet both prongs of verification of correction of noncompliance prior to the findings being issued.

Provide additional

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
148	148	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2020-2021 Month 03 Part C to B transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's Part C to B MSIS report showed that all timelines for students eligible for Part B services in Month 03 were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit via SharePoint eligibility determination and student IEPs, as evidence that the student had an IEP in place although it was after the student's 3rd birthday. The MDE OSE confirmed correction of noncompliance by reviewing eligibility determination and student IEPs and supporting documentation. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	11	11	0
FFY 2017	59	59	0
FFY 2016	51	51	0

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2020-2021 Month 03 Part C to B transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's Part C to B MSIS report showed that all timelines for students eligible for Part B services in Month 03 were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit via SharePoint eligibility determination and student IEPs, as evidence that the student had an IEP in place although it was after the student's 3rd birthday. The MDE OSE confirmed correction of noncompliance by reviewing eligibility determination and student IEPs and supporting documentation. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2020-2021 Month 03 Part C to B transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's Part C to B MSIS report showed that all timelines for students eligible for Part B services in Month 03 were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit via SharePoint eligibility determination and student IEPs, as evidence that the student had an IEP in place although it was after the student's 3rd birthday. The MDE OSE confirmed correction of noncompliance by reviewing eligibility determination and student IEPs and supporting documentation. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2020-2021 Month 03 Part C to B transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's Part C to B MSIS report showed that all timelines for students eligible for Part B services in Month 03 were compliant and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For the cases of individual noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit via SharePoint eligibility determination and student IEPs, as evidence that the student had an IEP in place although it was after the student's 3rd birthday. The MDE OSE confirmed correction of noncompliance by reviewing eligibility determination and student IEPs and supporting documentation. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, 59 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, and 51 uncorrected findings of noncompliance

identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, FFY 2017, and FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## **12 - OSEP Response**

### **12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.



## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.96%	99.93%	100.00%	99.99%	99.73%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
20,175	20,183	99.73%	100%	99.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

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.**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2020-2021 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, 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
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	13	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2019-2020 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each individual case of noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of each student's IEP including a completed transition plan, although past the student's 14th birthday. The MDE OSE reviewed each transition plan using an Indicator 13 checklist to ensure all components of the transition plan were included. Once MDE reviewed each transition plan and verified that it met the requirements of the Indicator 13 checklist, noncompliance was considered corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	1	1	0
FFY 2016	13	13	0

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2019-2020 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each individual case of noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of each student's IEP including a completed transition plan, although past the student's 14th birthday. The MDE OSE reviewed each transition plan using an Indicator 13 checklist to ensure all components of the transition plan were included. Once MDE reviewed each transition plan and verified that it met the requirements of the Indicator 13 checklist, noncompliance was considered corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from he LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The MDE OSE utilized the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) to review 2019-2020 Month 03 Transition data for each LEA identified as non compliant. A review of each noncompliant LEA's transition report in MSIS showed that all students aged 14 and older in Month 03 had transition plans in place and that regulatory requirements were being implemented.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each individual case of noncompliance, the LEA was required to submit documentation of each student's IEP including a completed transition plan, although past the student's 14th birthday. The MDE OSE reviewed each transition plan using an Indicator 13 checklist to ensure all components of the transition plan were included. Once MDE reviewed each transition plan and verified that it met the requirements of the Indicator 13 checklist, noncompliance was considered corrected. If a student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA and an IEP could not be implemented, the LEA was required to submit documentation of the student's withdrawal from the LEA. The MDE OSE verified this data using the Mississippi Student Information System.

### **13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, and 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

### **13 - OSEP Response**

#### **13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses 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. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	36.00%	27.79%	28.79%	29.79%	29.79%
A	25.81%	Data	29.01%	27.79%	25.04%	27.25%	25.81%
B	2019	Target >=	73.00%	67.12%	69.12%	69.12%	69.12%
B	60.09%	Data	66.78%	67.12%	60.79%	61.31%	60.09%
C	2019	Target >=	90.00%	85.09%	87.09%	89.09%	89.09%
C	74.27%	Data	84.38%	85.09%	77.75%	76.26%	74.27%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%
Target B >=	61.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%
Target C >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feed back through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 14 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 14, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 14 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 post-secondary data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. FFY2019 data includes all the necessary requirements set forth in the measurement table. Due to health and safety concerns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic LEAs had difficulty meeting with and getting survey data from parents. Health and Safety concerns also limited post-secondary job and education opportunities for students. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,244
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,018
Response Rate	89.93%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	665
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	718
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)	90
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).	217

Measure	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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	665	2,018	25.81%	26.00%	32.95%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,383	2,018	60.09%	61.00%	68.53%	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)	1,690	2,018	74.27%	75.00%	83.75%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	88.97%	89.93%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

LEAs may choose the method by which data for Indicator 14 are collected and are responsible for entering data into the Mississippi Student Information System. The MDE OSE will issue data reports and reminders to ensure LEAs are reaching out to students and their families to collect this data. The MDE OSE will also provide guidance and suggestions for increasing responsiveness.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The MDE OSE did not identify any nonresponse bias. The MDE OSE will continue to encourage LEA staff to allow multiple formats for students and parents to provide Indicator 14 data. By ensuring that all LEAs have access to data reports and work toward having all parents and students provide Indicator 14, the MDE OSE is confident that responsiveness will increase.

**Include the State's analyses 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.**

In the areas of Gender, Exit Type, LEP indicator, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 1 percentage point difference in respondents and leavers for any category. In the area of Race, MS saw no greater than 1.5 percentage points difference in respondents and leavers for any category.

In the area of gender, MDE found that the female group was underrepresented(-0.55% ) and the male group was overrepresented (0.55%).

In the area of exit code, the following exit codes had underrepresentation:

Graduated High School with Special Diploma (-0.29%) and  
Graduated with Regular High School Diploma (-1.17%)

The following exit codes were over represented:

Reached Maximum Age (0.04%) and  
Dropped Out (1.43%).

In the area of race, the following races had underrepresentation:

Asian (-0.05%),  
White (-1.00%),  
Hispanic/Latino (-0.16%),  
Native American (-0.45) , and  
Two or More Races (-0.01%).

The following race had overrepresentation:

Black/African American (1.67%)

In the area of disabilities, the following disabilities had underrepresentation:

Emotional Disability (-0.14%),  
Orthopedic Impairment (-0.10),  
Traumatic Brain Injury (-0.06), and  
Autism (-0.26%).

The following disabilities had overrepresentation:

Other Health Impairment (0.16%),  
Intellectual Disability (0.03%),  
Specific Learning Disability (0.23%).  
Language/Speech Impaired (0.04%),  
Multiple Disabilities (0.06%), and  
Visually Impaired (0.04%).

In the area of LEP indicator, the Y LEP indicators were underrepresented (-0.56%) and the N LEP Indicators were overrepresented by (0.56).

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

<b>Sampling Question</b>	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was sampling used?	NO
<b>Survey Question</b>	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on OSEP response, the MDE OSE provided the following clarification: Based on Stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that due to effects on data caused by the pandemic, that the FFY2019 post-secondary data is more representative of State data and that the FFY2019 should be used as baseline. FFY2019 data includes all the necessary requirements set forth in the measurement table. Due to health and safety concerns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic LEAs had difficulty meeting with and getting survey data from parents. Health and Safety concerns also limited post-secondary job and education opportunities for students. The MDE OSE plans to revisit this data with stakeholders during the 2022 – 2023 school year to determine what, if any, changes need to be made to the baseline and target data for this indicator

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**14 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	18
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	18

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 15 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 15, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 15 and implementation of performance plans for improvement. Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets remained the same and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	50.00%		50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	42.86%	20.00%	10.00%	26.67%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
18	18	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

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

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	4
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement.

Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator 16 data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of Indicator 16, historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for Indicator 16 and implementation of performance plans for improvement.

Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets remained the same and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	69.56%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	100.00%	86.96%	17.65%	18.18%	25.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	4	25.00%	75.00%	25.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

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

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

###### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The State will increase the percentage of third grade students who score proficient or higher on the regular State-wide reading assessment to 32 percent by FY 2025 for students with a Specific Learning Disability, Language/Speech, or Other Health Impairment rulings in targeted districts

The State will increase the percentage of eighth grade students who score proficient or higher on the regular State-wide reading assessment to 15 percent by FY 2025 for students with a Specific Learning Disability or Other Health Impairment rulings in targeted districts. This data is currently being collected. A baseline and target for this data will be set in the FFY2021 submission.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The Office Special Education in collaboration with the Office of School Improvement and the Office of Elementary Education and Reading, conducted an analysis to determine where students with disabilities showed the most opportunities for growth. In reviewing the elementary LEA survey data, teachers have reported increased understanding of the knowledge and skills needed to ensure high quality instruction in literacy. The SEA would like to see this increase replicated at the secondary. When analyzing assessment data, we identified the need to revise the SiMR to target the OHI eligibility category. Based on the impact of COVID-19 and the current rate of growth indicated, we anticipate that the baseline will continue to increase two percentage points each year. As part of our scale-up efforts, grade eight assessment data for SLD and OHI will now be included in the SiMR.

#### Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

- 2018-2019 & 2020-2021 Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) English Language Arts
- Schools identified through the Office of School Improvement for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)
- Analysis of the Special Education Performance Determination Reports to identify districts in Needs Assistance or Needs Intervention
- Stakeholder input

#### Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

- MAAP ELA data from SY 2018-2019 and SY 2020-2021 were analyzed to determine the baseline and target for grade three students identified as having an SLD, OHI, and LS only and for grade eight students identified as having an SLD or OHI eligibility.
- An analysis of the ATSI schools was used to identify which individual schools needed support based on Students with Disabilities, Black or African American, or Economically Disadvantaged students to determine where to provide SSIP literacy coach support and targeted technical assistance.
- Analysis of the Special Education Determination Reports was conducted to determine which districts needed differentiated supports based on the individualized needs of the district and their determination report.

#### Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Focus Groups, which included district and parent representation were conducted in the LEAs allowed parents to give feedback on the role the LEA plays in improving their student's reading level. It also provided an opportunity for them to determine if they thought the SiMR was reasonable, appropriate, and achievable. A session was conducted at the MDE annual Parent Conference. Participants were able to voice their concerns pertaining to the change in the SiMR. Meetings were held via zoom for the Special Education Advisory Panel, and information was shared in order to obtain feedback and address any concerns around changes to the SiMR. Also, during OSE Virtual Office Hours, feedback was received from our State Special Education Directors relevant to the proposed SiMR setting. In addition, State Performance Plan Stakeholder Meetings were held via TEAMS to obtain feedback pertinent to setting the SiMR.

A session was conducted during the Building Partnerships .. Working Together Mississippi Parent Conference where parents were involved in voicing their concerns and recommendations for the SiMR.

The MDE held a series of eight regional literacy meetings across the State for families of students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. At each meeting, families received an overview of the State law concerning literacy and assessment, as well as strategies that can be used at home to help students improve their reading skills. The State law, known as the Literacy-Based Promotion Act (LBPA), focuses on prevention and intervention to help children develop the reading skills required for 4th grade.

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset of data for Target A is 3rd grade students that have an eligibility of Specific Learning Disability or Language/Speech impairments.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

[https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ffy19\\_ssiip\\_pdf\\_final\\_04.01.2021\\_with\\_answers.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ffy19_ssiip_pdf_final_04.01.2021_with_answers.pdf)

#### Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Target B will include students in grade eight who are identified as having an SLD or OHI eligibility. When analyzing assessment data, there is a need to revise the SiMR to include students identified as OHI to expand the eligibility categories the SEA will measure. It is also important to provide support to students in grades four through eight in order to sustain the growth made at the lower elementary level. Based on the impact of COVID-19 and the current rate of growth indicated, we anticipate that the baseline will continue to increase two percentage points each year.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014	16.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>= =	24.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

		FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
		0.00%	24.00%		N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) English Language Arts

The numerator is the total number of 3rd grade SLD and L/S students who scored proficient in the identified school which is 60 and the denominator is the total number of 3rd grade SLD and L/S student in the identified school districts which is 234.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

- The Office of Technology and Strategic Services (OTSS) disaggregated the data into the following categories:
- Percentage of students State-wide who scored proficient or advanced on the 3rd grade ELA MAAP assessment
  - Percentage of 3rd grade students with SLD and/or Speech/Language ruling State-wide scoring proficient or advanced
  - Percentage of students State-wide who scored proficient or advanced on the 8th grade ELA MAAP assessment
  - Percentage of 8th grade students with SLD and OHI State-wide scoring proficient or advanced

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Mississippi districts are allowed to select an MDE approved Universal Reading Screener. The screeners are administered 3 times a year to provide a critical “first look” at the individual literacy needs of students. We analyzed universal screener data for our target.

In addition, Learning Walks were conducted as an opportunity for administrators and the literacy coaches to obtain a brief snapshot of instruction and learning in the classroom. Observation data was collected using the MDE Learning Walk protocol which includes the following elements: 1) instruction (application of concepts), 2) instruction (instructional strategies), 3) classroom atmosphere and preparation/planning, 4) writing and literacy centers. Classroom observations were conducted to obtain a brief snapshot of the interaction between the classroom teachers, SSIP literacy coaches, and students where appropriate.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) released achievement gap data for students who took State-wide assessments in English language arts (ELA) in the 2020-21 school year. The gap analysis includes a note of caution for interpreting the results because COVID-19 disrupted so many facets of education. The disruptions may have influenced a student's opportunity to learn, motivation and/or assessment administration conditions. Also, proficiency decreased among all student subgroups, including students with disabilities, with some decreasing more than others. These decreases likely reflect the disparate impact of the pandemic on certain subgroups.

As stated previously, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted many facets of education including instruction and assessment during the 2020-2021 school year. These disruptions may have influenced a student's opportunity to learn, motivation and/or assessment administration conditions. Many LEAs were virtual or hybrid for most of the school year. This impacted the completeness of surveys. Brainspring offered Virtual Livestream courses where participants interacted with an instructor via computer in real time and virtual self-paced courses where participants had 30 days access to work at their own pace. Some participants reported that there was not enough time to complete the virtual self-paced course or to completely understand the objectives. The 2019-2020 SY was the final cycle for districts identified as SSIP districts. The MDE, OSE began the process of moving to a different model, which included hiring SSIP literacy coaches. A Request for Applications (RFA) was advertised in July 2020 and no applicants applied for the SSIP literacy coach position. The RFA was re-advertised in December 2020, with new hires going to the State Board of Education in May 2021. Multiple efforts were made to advertise the positions, but there was a lack of response, due in part to COVID-19, to district's shortage of teachers, and districts unwillingness to allow teachers or other candidates to terminate contracts to seek future employment.

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

[https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ffy19\\_ssip\\_pdf\\_final\\_04.01.2021\\_with\\_answers.pdf](https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/ffy19_ssip_pdf_final_04.01.2021_with_answers.pdf)

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The Office of Special Education (OSE) collaborated with the Office of School Improvement (OSI) and Elementary Education and Reading (OEER) in determining which schools to support. The OEER collaborated with the OSE to provide Middle School Science of Reading Training for teachers of grades six through eight. The OSE and OEER continued to train MDE and SSIP literacy coaches together so that schools across the State were provided the same professional learning and resources. An Access for All, Access for All 2.0, and Specially Designed Instruction Guides were developed by the MDE, MS Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL), teachers, and administrators. These documents aid in providing quality instruction for all students and helps educators reflect on their practices as they plan, implement, and deliver instruction to support the learning progress of all students. All the documents can be found on MDE's website and can be downloaded for use.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

A team of 112 coaches support teachers and school leaders in the areas of literacy, early childhood education, special education, school improvement and digital learning. The offices collaborate and align resources to provide PD for educators to support the delivery of high quality, evidence-based literacy instruction for ALL students.

The MDE has designated seven elementary schools as the State's first Mississippi Emerging Science of Reading Schools (SoR). This recognition is for schools that have trained teachers in the science of reading, exemplified a change of instructional practices, and embodied a school culture that focuses on building skillful, strong readers in kindergarten through grade 3. This is another vital step in scaling-up beyond the targeted groups in the SSIP. The MDE Communications sent an email to educators across the State with a link to new resources for the Access for All and Access for All 2.0 Guides. A presentation was held at the Mississippi Association of School Superintendents conference, in which the presenters provided information on the technical assistance available to increase inclusive practices. The PowerPoint can be found on the MDE website. Copies of A Family Guide to Special Education Services and Specially Designed Instruction Guidance Document were sent to districts. All the documents can be found on the MDE website. All of these strategies are necessary to achieve the SiMR and to sustain improvement efforts as the State works to scale-up. Collaborating across the MDE offices allows the SEA to provide targeted, evidence-based supports to districts who have the most urgent needs. It also allows the SEA to see where supports can be disseminated via cross office support. As we scale-up to include secondary students, the SEA must build capacity at the LEAs so that student achievement does not decrease between grades three and eight.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The MDE, OSE will continue to post solicitations through a Request for Applications to employ additional SSIP Literacy Coaches. As we are able to recruit additional SSIP coaches, we anticipate including additional schools, specifically on the secondary level.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Report  
Phonics First® courses offered by Brainspring  
Professional Development Coordinators (PDC) Professional Learning Opportunities  
Learning Walks

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

From August 2021-December 2021, the SSIP literacy coaches provided the following combined supports to staff at their identified schools:  
Co-teaching (16 opportunities)  
Modeling (75 opportunities)



Conferences (243 opportunities)  
PLCs (81 opportunities)  
PDs (8 opportunities)  
Debriefs (98 opportunities)

From January 2021-December 2021, a total of 995 participants were trained using Phonics First®:  
Phonics First Level I Livestream Course with Implementation Kit (327)  
Level II Livestream Course (50)  
Phonics First Level I with Implementation Kit (148)  
Structures with Implementation Kit (8)  
Phonics Primary Self-Paced e-Learning with Implementation Kit (1)  
Phonics First Level I Self-Paced e-Learning with Implementation Kit (310)  
Structures Level I Self-Paced e-Learning with Implementation Kit (53)  
Phonics First Level I Self-Paced Refresher (94)  
Structures Level I Self-Paced Refresher (4)

From July 1, 2021-December 1, 2021, the Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) through the Office of Special Education provide the following supports to educators across Mississippi:

Canvas Course:  
Reading Connections

Special Education Chats:  
IEP Basics

Professional Development Sessions:  
The Norms of Co-Teaching  
PLAAFP  
Adapting Grade Level Texts for Students with Disabilities  
Whose Responsibility Is It Anyway? Teacher Buy In on Strategies to Meet the Individual Needs of a Student  
Teaching for All: Inclusive Strategies  
Baseline, Goals, and Progress Monitoring

From January 2021-December 2021, the Office of Professional Development ELA PDCs offered the following supports to educators across Mississippi:

Face-to-Face & Virtual PD Sessions: 94	Number of Participants: 1,864
Canvas Courses: 23	Number of Participants: 521
PD On Demand Series: 2	Number of Views: 1,522

From September 2021-October 2021, the SSIP Literacy Coaches conducted Learning Walks:  
Elementary: 5 Learning Walks  
Middle: 2 Learning Walks

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

Literacy coaches work with the MDE to coordinate the Literacy-Based Promotion Act and provide appropriate services to schools so that there can be a cohesive, sustained, intensive and classroom-focused approach that is rigorous, engaging, and relevant for students. Literacy coaches will provide a non-threatening, open, professional, and collaborative work relationship with district-level school personnel, school-based literacy coaches, principals, and teachers. They are required to effectively identify the needs of assigned schools to prioritize, schedule, organize, and provide technical assistance so that students in assigned schools achieve grade level reading by the end of grades three and eight.

Phonics First® is a thirty (30) hour course offered by Brainspring to instruct teachers in the use of multisensory literacy instructional strategies rooted in Orton-Gillingham methodology. Internationally accredited through both the International Dyslexia Association and the International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council, Phonics First® provides an evidence-based program that trains participants to explicitly and systematically deliver phonics-based, structured, multisensory, direct instruction to reach ALL students.

The OSE, in conjunction with the Office of Professional Development (PDCs) provides professional learning opportunities, technical assistance to schools, and monitors schools for student outcomes and compliance with the regulations of the IDEA.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Reports are submitted to the building administrator and the MDE OSE. The coaches conduct observations and coaching at grade-level and/or school-wide. Professional development is provided with the coach indicating the topics, audience, and number of participants. Data analysis is conducted based on data from screeners, assessments, teacher-student ratio, etc. Other activities are conducted to identify next steps and contributing factors.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Beginning of the Year (BOY) Universal Screener and Diagnostic Assessment data indicated the following data:  
School 1 (100% of SLD, OHI, & LS are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 2 (100% of SLD & OHI and 81% of LS are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 3 (75% of SLD, 100 of OHI, and 50% of LS are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 4 (100% of SLD & OHI and 89% of LS are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 5 (100% of SLD, OHI, & LS are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 6 (100% of SLD & OHI are 1 or more grade levels below)  
School 7 (100% of SLD & 71% of OHI are 1 or more grade levels below)

Mississippi Annual Review Survey Analytical Results for 2020-2021 Brainspring Educator Academy had 103 respondents indicating they completed the training within the last 12 to 24 months.

85.4% of respondents indicated that they are currently using strategies learned in Phonics First®.

48.9 % use the Phonics First® strategies in the general education setting in whole group, the special education setting in a small group, intervention, or other small group.

33 respondents agreed that they have seen improvements in student learning as a result of implementing Phonics First®.

32 respondents agreed that students were engaged in phonics instruction.

46 respondents intend to register for Level II in the future.

68 respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they feel supported by their administrators in how they were implementing Phonics First®.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Students will be administered Middle of the Year (MOY) and End of the Year (EOY) universal screener to evaluate if growth was made over time. Phonics First® will continue to be provided to educators across the State.

### **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

#### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Mississippi Department of Education solicited stakeholder feedback through multiple in person and virtual meetings with teachers, administrators, special education directors, representatives of parent advocacy groups, and parents as outlined in the Introduction. Stakeholder feedback was also solicited from the Special Education Advisory Panel. The Mississippi Department of Education, Office of Special Education Data Team worked internally and with technical assistance providers to analyze Indicator data and develop suggested targets. Stakeholders were presented with an overview of each Indicator historical data, and suggested FFY20-FFY 25 targets for each indicator and implementation of performance plans for improvement.

Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the suggested target and determine if the suggested targets were reasonable or needed to be revised. Based on stakeholder feedback, suggested targets were revised and are included in the FFY20 SPP.

#### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

A session was conducted during the Building Partnerships ... Working Together Mississippi Parent Conference where parents were involved in voicing their concerns and recommendations for the SiMR.

Focus Groups, which included district and parent representation, were conducted in the LEAs allowed parents to give feedback on the role the LEA plays in improving their student's reading level. It also provided an opportunity for them to determine if they thought the SiMR was reasonable, appropriate, and achievable. A session was conducted at MDE's annual parent conference. Participants were able to voice their concerns pertaining to the change in the SiMR. Meetings were held via zoom for the Special Education Advisory Panel, and information was shared in order to obtain feedback and address any concerns around changes to the SiMR. Also, during OSE Virtual Office Hours, feedback was received from our State Special Education Directors relevant to the proposed SiMR setting. In addition, State Performance Plan Stakeholder Meetings were held via Teams to obtain feedback pertinent to setting the SiMR.

The MDE held a series of eight regional literacy meetings across the State for families of students in kindergarten through third grade. At each meeting, families received an overview of the State law concerning literacy and assessment, as well as strategies that can be used at home to help students improve their reading skills. The State law, known as the Literacy-Based Promotion Act (LBPA), focuses on prevention and intervention to help children develop the reading skills required for 4th grade.

#### **Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

#### **Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

N/A

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

#### **Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

N/A

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **17 - OSEP Response**

The State has continued the baseline for Target A for this indicator, using data from FFY 2014, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State has added an additional set of data to the SiMR and that additional data is not reflected in the 2014 data.

The State has revised the baseline for Target B for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the baseline

must be set to FFY 2020 as the FFY of this SPP/APR report and to reflect the additional set of data added to the SiMR.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's baselines cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

OSEP notes that the State provided the descriptions of the numerator and denominator in the narrative, however did not provide the descriptions in the FFY 2020 data table.

The State did not provide FFY 2020 data for Target A of this Indicator ;however, the State provided data to the Department under Title I of ESEA using EdFacts file specifications 178 and 188. The State must provide Target A data for FFY 2020, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State did not provide FFY 2020 data for Target B of this Indicator; however, the State provided data for Indicator 3 which has the same data source. The State must provide Target B data for FFY 2020, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State indicated it is not using a subset of the population. However, the State described that the SiMR is based on the percentage of third and eight grade students who score proficient or higher on the regular State-wide reading assessment. The State must address this discrepancy.

The State did not provide an Evaluation Plan. The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Evaluation Plan.

The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

## **17 - Required Actions**

The State did not provide data for FFY 2020; therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State's FFY 2020 data are valid and reliable. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State did not provide a Theory of Action. The State must provide a link to the current Theory of Action in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State did not provide an Evaluation Plan. The State must provide a link to the current Evaluation Plan in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State must provide the required numerator and denominator descriptions within the data table in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

**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.**

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

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:**

Robin Lemonis

#### **Title:**

State Director of Special Education

#### **Email:**

rlemonis@mdek12.org

#### **Phone:**

601-359-3489

#### **Submitted on:**

04/28/22 10:30:29 PM