

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Mississippi



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**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

150

General Supervision System:

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

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 feed back on the documents reviewed and analyzed.

Technical assistance needs are data-driven and evolve from many activities/sources including bu 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.

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 provided during a training session. While the EIR of 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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

100

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, Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the current and historical data. Based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

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.

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. Meetings were held via zoom and in person 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.

SSIP literacy coaches will hold 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 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school year. All meetings were advertised 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.

The MDE OSE will make results of target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public by posting the SPP/APR to the Public Reporting page on the MDE OSE's website within 30 days of the final submission of the SPP/APR. The MDE OSE will also share the results of target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation with the Special Education Advisory Panel which is open to the public on ongoing basis throughout the year.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

LEA performance data, the SPP, and other public reporting data is located on the MDE website at the following link: www.mdek12.org/ose/spp-apr.

Intro - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

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 continue to strengthen guidelines and practices for the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) during the first year of the implementation. Through work with the CEEDAR Center, the MDE OSE has developed implemented 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. The MDE OSE has also worked extensively with IDC to develop data processes and procedures for the Office of Data and Compliance within the MDE Office of Special Education.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	81.00%	38.78%	43.18%	43.18%	60.00%
Data	34.68%	36.39%	38.37%	42.15%	65.50%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,240
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	693

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	8
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	445

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2,240	3,386	65.50%	62.00%	66.15%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

For FFY 2021 graduation data, all students were required to meet the 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 Appedices A-1 through A-4 of the Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2021. These requirements are not different for students with disabilities. Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2021 can be found at https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/mississippi_public_school_accountability_standards_2021_8.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)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

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.

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

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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.

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.

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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	10.77%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data	9.09%	9.72%	11.10%	13.05%	8.48%

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,240
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	693

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	8
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	445

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
445	3,386	8.48%	10.00%	13.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage in Indicator 2 to the elimination of virtual and hybrid learning options as well as the re-instatement of Statewide assessments. These factors along with learning gaps created during the COVID-19 Pandemic contributed to 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 was enrolled at some point during the month, has not met one of the exclusionary conditions listed above and is no longer attending school will be reported on the monthly attendance report as a dropout.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (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

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	2020	95.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	92.09%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	96.97%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	95.44%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	91.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	96.00%

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,366	5,146	3,626
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,006	340	185
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,737	3,999	2,784
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	512	574	589

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,366	5,150	3,541
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,002	361	233
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,736	3,976	2,679
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	514	573	553

*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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,255	5,366	95.51%	97.00%	97.93%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,913	5,146	92.09%	97.00%	95.47%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3,558	3,626	96.97%	97.00%	98.12%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,252	5,366	95.44%	97.00%	97.88%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,910	5,150	91.91%	97.00%	95.34%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3,465	3,541	96.00%	97.00%	97.85%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

Links to public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/SPP-APR under the links titled:

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Alternate Proficiency (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 MAAP Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_participation_sw_d_accom_posted.xlsx)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, 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 school level. 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 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 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 school level. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

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	2020	16.22%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	8.19%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	7.78%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	15.12%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	8.58%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.42%

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

Date:

04/05/2023

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	4,743	4,339	2,969
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	463	82	51
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	407	316	298

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	4,738	4,337	2,912
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	515	119	109
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	518	450	833

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	870	4,743	16.22%	20.00%	18.34%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	398	4,339	8.19%	13.00%	9.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	349	2,969	7.78%	13.00%	11.75%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,033	4,738	15.12%	20.00%	21.80%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	569	4,337	8.58%	12.00%	13.12%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	942	2,912	7.42%	12.00%	32.35%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

Links to public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/SPP-APR under the links titled:

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Alternate Proficiency (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 MAAP Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_participation_sw_d_accom_posted.xlsx)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

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 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 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. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

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	2020	34.15%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	48.38%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	52.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	36.63%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	41.68%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	31.03%

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	512	574	589
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	143	272	250

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	514	573	553
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	165	200	160

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	143	512	34.15%	37.00%	27.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	272	574	48.38%	52.00%	47.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	250	589	52.22%	52.00%	42.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage to the continued impact lack of in-person instruction during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The MDE OSE will continue to review the trend data for this indicator and work across offices within the MDE to develop improvement strategies.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage to the continued impact lack of in-person instruction during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The MDE OSE will continue to review the trend data for this indicator and work across offices within the MDE to develop improvement strategies.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	165	514	36.63%	42.00%	32.10%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	200	573	41.68%	47.00%	34.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	160	553	31.03%	32.00%	28.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

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.

Links to public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/SPP-APR under the links titled:

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Alternate Proficiency (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 MAAP Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_participation_swd_accom_posted.xlsx)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2021 data represent slippage from the FFY 2020 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2021 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage for FFY 2021 Math Assessment Grades 4, 8, and HS.

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 school level. 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 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 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 school level. In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2020	20.99
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	27.44
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	27.01
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	18.11
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	25.68
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	25.72

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	31,936	34,062	31,552
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,743	4,339	2,969
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13,018	11,050	13,162
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	979	590	555
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	463	82	51
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	407	316	298

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	31,906	35,575	31,159
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,738	4,337	2,912
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13,355	15,025	18,546
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,161	871	1,296
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	515	119	109
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	518	450	833

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.34%	43.83%	20.99	17.00	25.49	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.17%	34.17%	27.40	23.00	25.00	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	11.75%	43.47%	27.01	23.00	31.72	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage to the continued impact lack of in-person instruction during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The MDE OSE will continue to review the trend data for this indicator and work across offices within the MDE to develop improvement strategies.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage to the continued impact lack of in-person instruction during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The MDE OSE will continue to review the trend data for this indicator and work across offices within the MDE to develop improvement strategies.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.80%	45.50%	18.11	14.00	23.69	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	13.12%	44.68%	25.68	23.00	31.56	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	32.35%	63.68%	25.72	23.00	31.33	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Links to public reports of assessment results can be found at www.mdek12.org/SPP-APR under the links titled:

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_alt_participation_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 Alternate Proficiency (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-22_alt_proficiency_posted.xlsx)

Assessment Public Reporting 2021-2022 MAAP Participation (https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/2021-2022_maap_participation_swd_accom_posted.xlsx)

3D - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

3D - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2021 data represent slippage from the FFY 2020 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2021 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage for FFY 2021 Math Assessment Grades 4, 8, and HS.

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR required the State, with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, to establish a baseline for 8th Grade Reading with accurate data and ensure its FFY 2025 target for 8th Grade Reading reflects improvement. The State did not provide this data; therefore, OSEP is unable to accept the baseline and targets.

3D - Required Actions

The State did not, as required by the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR, establish a baseline for 8th Grade Reading with accurate data and ensure its FFY 2025 target for 8th Grade Reading reflects improvement. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	9.59%	4.76%	4.70%	10.27%	12.06%

Targets

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

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

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 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 2021 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.

10

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	142	12.06%	0.00%	0.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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 §3000170(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. 10 districts were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum n/cell size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 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 be submitted with the LEA response. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding 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 SEA identified 1 LEA as having significant discrepancy in FFY21 based on FFY20 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 FFY21 based on FFY20 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 policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral interventions 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 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The MDE OSE needs to correct the data submitted for FFY2019 and FFY2020. While there were LEAs identified with significant discrepancy in FFY2019 and FFY2020, it has been verified by the MDE OSE that the significant discrepancy identified was not the result of inappropriate policies practices or procedures. Nor was due to the lack of implementation of those policies practices or procedures.

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

12

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	140	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 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 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 they 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. The State uses a minimum n-size/cell size of 10.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 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 be submitted with the LEA response. Whenever it is determined that inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to a significant discrepancy, a finding 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 SEA identified 6 districts as having significant discrepancy in FFY21 based on FFY20 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 21 based on FFY20 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 policies, practices or procedures and that all LEAs implemented positive behavioral interventions 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 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	29		

4B - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The MDE OSE needs to correct the data submitted for FFY2019 and FFY2020. While there were LEAs identified with significant discrepancy in FFY2019 and FFY2020, it has been verified by the MDE OSE that the significant discrepancy identified was not the result of inappropriate policies practices or procedures. Nor was due to the lack of implementation of those policies practices or procedures.

4B - OSEP Response

The State reported that it has established a minimum n size of 10. However, OSEP notes that the State did not provide a description of what this value represents, which is information that would enable OSEP to determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify significant discrepancies in its LEAs. OSEP encourages the State to provide this information in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

4B- Required Actions

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b) was not corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 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 2022 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	60.97%	61.47%	61.97%	61.97%	77.00%
A	77.52%	Data	63.01%	65.28%	70.27%	76.42%	77.52%
B	2020	Target <=	14.48%	13.98%	13.48%	13.48%	13.00%
B	11.47%	Data	15.09%	13.89%	12.22%	11.22%	11.47%
C	2020	Target <=	2.04%	1.97%	1.90%	1.90%	1.00%
C	1.70%	Data	1.87%	1.92%	1.88%	1.90%	1.70%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%
Target B <=	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	63,751

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	50,248
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,236
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	465
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	112
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	418

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	50,248	63,751	77.52%	78.00%	78.82%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,236	63,751	11.47%	12.00%	11.35%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	995	63,751	1.70%	1.00%	1.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	64.95%	65.00%	65.05%	65.05%	60.00%
A	Data	62.49%	58.42%	59.16%	59.58%	45.04%
B	Target <=	14.87%	14.82%	14.77%	14.77%	16.00%
B	Data	16.93%	17.32%	16.27%	16.65%	24.96%

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	1,055	2,054	712	3,821
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	331	1,009	346	1,686
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	258	418	180	856
b2. Number of children attending separate school	63	75	22	160
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	28	27	5	60

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	1,686	3,821	45.04%	61.00%	44.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,016	3,821	24.96%	14.00%	26.59%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	60	3,821	0.95%	1.00%	1.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage in Indicator 6B to increased learning gaps for preschool students due to limited Head Start and Early intervention services caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. This learning gaps required students to require more intensive and specialized instruction. However, as Head Start and other Early Intervention services have returned to pre-pandemic operations, along with the fact that there are more Early Childhood programs on school campuses than there have ever been, the MDE OSE fully expects to see the targets met for this indicator in the future.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable

The MDE OSE believes that post-pandemic many parents of students with disabilities and significant health issues have determined that the safest option for their student receiving services is to receive those services in the home.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2013	Target >=	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
A1	56.99%	Data	49.80%	48.25%	47.30%	50.00%	50.19%

A2	2013	Target >=	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
A2	81.74%	Data	78.44%	75.40%	76.58%	77.78%	75.82%
B1	2013	Target >=	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
B1	64.01%	Data	61.60%	53.54%	60.98%	60.82%	56.05%
B2	2013	Target >=	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
B2	74.37%	Data	72.43%	67.45%	70.83%	71.21%	68.54%
C1	2013	Target >=	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
C1	42.24%	Data	38.06%	32.94%	40.05%	39.47%	36.42%
C2	2013	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%
C2	71.78%	Data	70.68%	64.90%	69.57%	70.72%	66.57%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
Target A2 >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B1 >=	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
Target B2 >=	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
Target C1 >=	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
Target C2 >=	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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

54

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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	7.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	11	20.37%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	13	24.07%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	26	48.15%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A,	24	28	50.19%	62.00%	85.71%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
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>							
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>	39	54	75.82%	87.00%	72.22%	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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	1.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	9	16.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7	12.96%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	37	68.52%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	16	17	56.05%	69.00%	94.12%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	44	54	68.54%	79.00%	81.48%	Met target	No 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	1	1.85%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	11.11%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	8	14.81%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	24	44.44%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15	27.78%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	32	39	36.42%	47.00%	82.05%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	39	54	66.57%	77.00%	72.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The MDE OSE attributes slippage in this area to several factors. Head Start facilities that were closed during the pandemic had difficulty re-opening due to staff shortages. Slippage can also be attributed to the impact the lack of in-person instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic had on preschool children.

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)

YES

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

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)

The MDE OSE implemented the COS Process in July 2021. This is the first year of complete data for the COS process. The MDE OSE has invested significant time and professional development in preparing LEAs for this change and in the implementation of the COS process. Every district was given individualized feedback on the first several Entry assessments that were completed using the COS process. The MDE OSE and MDE Office of Early Childhood has provided comprehensive guidance and support to LEAs regarding the COS process. That guidance and support can be found here: <https://www.mdek12.org/OSE/EC/ecse-indicator-7>. As the COS process continues to be implemented the MDE OSE fully expects to see the data stabilize.

7 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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 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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	96.47%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	83.46%	85.46%	87.46%	87.46%	97.00%
Data	97.19%	97.23%	97.31%	96.47%	96.41%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
25,864	27,078	96.41%	97.00%	95.52%	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.

67,572

Percentage of respondent parents

40.07%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	36.32%	40.07%

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. In order to address underrepresentation, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group.

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 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 will continue to work towards ensuring the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents and will continue to do so. In order to address underrepresentation, the parent survey participation report that is provided to districts will be broken down by racial and ethnic groups and eligibility so that LEAs can monitor the participation of each group. Additionally in the Spring, the MDE OSE will host a series of data analysis meetings with LEAs to analyze their parent survey participation and develop action plans to increase participation across a broad and representative cross-section of parents.

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

In the area of gender, MDE found that the male group was underrepresented (-1.12%) and the female group was overrepresented (1.12%).

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

- Asian (-0.01%),
- Black/African American (-3.33%),
- Hispanic/Latino (-0.18%), and
- Two or More Races (-0.83%).

The following races had overrepresentation:

- Native American (0.01),
- Pacific Islander (0.03), and
- White (4.30%).

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

- Autism (-1.97%),
- Deaf-Blind (-0.09%)
- Developmentally Delayed (-1.13%),
- Intellectual Disability (-0.02%),
- Language/Speech Impaired (-0.05%),
- Multiple Disabilities (-0.15%),

Other Health Impairment (-14.61%),
 Specific Learning Disability (-0.28%)
 Traumatic Brain Injury (-0.07%) and
 Visually Impaired (-0.08%).

The following disabilities had overrepresentation:
 Emotional Disability (1.0%),
 Hearing Impaired (0.01%), and
 Orthopedic Impairment (17.44%).

Areas of review that had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3% are:
 Orthopedic Impairment overrepresented by 17.44%
 Other Health Impairment underrepresented by -14.61%
 Black/African American underrepresented by -3.33%
 White overrepresented by 4.30%

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?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias or identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported "Areas of review that had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3% are: Orthopedic Impairment overrepresented by 17.44%; Other Health Impairment underrepresented by -14.61%; Black/African American underrepresented by -3.33%; and White overrepresented by 4.30%". Therefore, OSEP cannot determine whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services using the metric of +/-3%. However, in its narrative, the State reported "Areas of review that had overrepresentation or underrepresentation of more than 3% are: Orthopedic Impairment overrepresented by 17.44%; Other Health Impairment underrepresented by -14.61%; Black/African American underrepresented by -3.33%; and White overrepresented by 4.30%". In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

5

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	147	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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).

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2 LEAs 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 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 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The MDE OSE needs to correct the data submitted for FFY2019. While there were LEAs identified with disproportionate representation in FFY2019, it has been verified by the MDE OSE that the disproportionate representation identified was not the result of inappropriate policies practices or procedures. Nor was due to the lack of implementation of those policies practices or procedures.

9 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data. The State reported that 147 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and five districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, does not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2021 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

9 - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

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 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 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

5

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
12	0	145	NVR	0%	0.00%	Met target	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).

Data analysis was conducted 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: (# of non-Black ID students in the State / # 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 12 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 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The MDE OSE needs to correct the data submitted for FFY2019. While there were LEAs identified with disproportionate representation in FFY2019, it has been verified by the MDE OSE that the disproportionate representation identified was not the result of inappropriate policies practices or procedures. Nor was due to the lack of implementation of those policies practices or procedures.

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.73%	99.96%	99.95%	98.08%	99.68%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8,829	8,803	99.68%	100%	99.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

26

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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	0	0

FFY 2020 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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	58.54%	89.50%	95.20%	80.53%	87.24%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,286
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	125

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	427
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.	369
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	427	792	87.24%	100%	53.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The MDE OSE attributes slippage in this indicator to significant issues with Part C's data system. The part C data system continues to include students that were referred to Part C and are no longer receiving services or never received services due to lack of delay. These students no longer have active records with Part C and it is very difficult to contact parents without updated information. Part C Data system has not been sending Part C to B files to MDE on a consistent basis. Finally, Part C has not been identifying the district of residence for students which is problematic when attempting to ensure the correct district receives the referral. Additionally, Part C has an extreme shortage of Early Intervention Coordinators which is very problematic for LEAs. It is difficult to get timely referrals from Part C due to lack of staff.

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

365

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.

3365 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
4. Student was dismissed from Part C with no delays present
5. Referred to Part C but never received early intervention services due to lack of delay

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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
85	85		0

FFY 2020 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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.93%	100.00%	99.99%	99.73%	99.96%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
20,607	20,616	99.96%	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 2021-2022 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 2020

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 2020 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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

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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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. 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.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2019	Target >=	27.79%	28.79%	29.79%	29.79%	26.00%
A	25.81%	Data	27.79%	25.04%	27.25%	25.81%	32.95%
B	2019	Target >=	67.12%	69.12%	69.12%	69.12%	61.00%
B	60.09%	Data	67.12%	60.79%	61.31%	60.09%	68.53%
C	2019	Target >=	85.09%	87.09%	89.09%	89.09%	75.00%
C	74.27%	Data	85.09%	77.75%	76.26%	74.27%	83.75%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%
Target B >=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%
Target C >=	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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,327
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,061
Response Rate	88.57%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	727
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	766
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)	94
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).	181

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	727	2,061	32.95%	28.00%	35.27%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,493	2,061	68.53%	62.00%	72.44%	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)	1,768	2,061	83.75%	75.00%	85.78%	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	2020	2021
Response Rate	89.93%	88.57%

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

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. 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.

In the areas of Gender, Exit Type, LEP indicator, Race, and Disability, MS saw no greater than 2.5 percentage point difference in respondents and leavers for any category.

In the area of gender, MDE found that the female group was underrepresented (0.26%) and the male group was overrepresented (-0.26%).

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

Dropped Out (-0.47%) and
 Graduated with Regular High School Diploma (-1.96%)

The following exit codes were overrepresented:

Graduated High School with Special Diploma (0.02%) and
 Reached Maximum Age (2.41%).

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

Asian (-0.03%),
 White (-1.07%) and
 Two or More Races (-0.01%).

The following race had overrepresentation:

Black/African American (0.70%),
 Hispanic/Latino (0.35%), and
 Pacific Islander (0.04%).

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

Emotional Disability (0.32%),
 Orthopedic Impairment (0.02),
 Specific Learning Disability (0.14%),
 Traumatic Brain Injury (0.06), and
 Autism (0.17%).

The following disabilities had underrepresentation:

Other Health Impairment (-0.22%),
 Intellectual Disability (-0.17%),
 Language/Speech Impaired (-0.11%),
 Multiple Disabilities (-0.14%), and
 Visually Impaired (-0.08%).

In the area of LEP indicator, the Y LEP indicators were overrepresented (0.16%) and the N LEP Indicators were underrepresented by (-0.16%).

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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	5
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	5

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=		50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Data	20.00%	10.00%	26.67%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5	5	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	4
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	69.56%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	86.96%	17.65%	18.18%	25.00%	25.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=					
--------------	--	--	--	--	--

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2	4	25.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to provide 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 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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)?

Increase the percentage of third grade students with Specific Learning Disability (SLD) and Language/Speech (LS) rulings in targeted districts who score proficient or higher on the general statewide reading assessment to 32 percent by FFY 2025.

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

NO

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.

Grade three (3) students with disabilities who have an eligibility of SLD or LS.

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/Offices/MDE/OAE/OSE/SPP-APR/ssip_theory_of_action.pdf

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of subset scoring proficient	Number of subset assessed	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
15	50		24.00%	30.00%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) English Language Arts

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 statewide who scored a level 4 or 5 on the grade three (3) MAAP ELA

Percentage of grade three (3) students statewide with an SLD and Speech/Language ruling who scored a level 4 or 5 on the MAAP ELA

Percentage of grade three (3) students in targeted districts with an SLD and Speech/Language ruling who scored a level 4 or 5 on the MAAP ELA

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. Screener data is used to target specific student deficits in reading. 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 are conducted to obtain a brief snapshot of the interaction between the classroom teacher(s), 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)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/Offices/MDE/OAE/OSE/SPP-APR/ssip_evaluation_activities.pdf

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

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

The evaluation plan was updated to reflect an SSIP Advisory Board that will help to determine needed revisions or changes to the evaluation plan. It also reflects updates to SSIP literacy coaches that hired during the reporting period.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The evaluation plan has not been changed. Only updates were reflected.

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

The Office of Special Education (OSE) collaborated with the Offices 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 to continue building capacity across the State. 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. The OSE employed a Literacy Coordinator (K-8) as well as three additional literacy coaches as we work to scale-up the literacy team to support additional districts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in the coming school years. The Offices of Special Education, Student Intervention Services, and School Improvement, as well as a staff member of Realizing Excellence for ALL Children in Mississippi (REACH MS), continues to engage in Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CSLCs) through the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). The collaboratives are designed to increase SEA capacity in improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Our State team has members in the Evidence- Based Practices, Improving Low-Performing School Systems, and Results-Based Accountability and Support learning collaboratives.

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.

The MDE released the 2021-2022 Superintendent's Annual Report Mississippi Succeeds Road to Recovery which highlights how committed MS is to providing all the support and resources necessary to ensure academic progress continues for all Mississippi students. MDE's coaching model has proven to be an effective method of transforming Mississippi schools and improving student achievement. Developed around transformational coaching, it is a powerful, comprehensive and systematic way to plan and organize coaching supports. A team of 107 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.

Literacy School-Based Support

1,404 model lessons to literacy support schools

993 professional learning sessions

499 co-teaching lessons

523 educators participated in Language Essentials for Teacher Reading and Spelling (LETRS) training

8 cross-state literacy collaboration session

545 educators attended 90 sessions during the Mississippi Literacy Association Conference

The MDE has invested more than \$96 million in federal American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds to provide products and services to support student health, safety and learning statewide. MDE procured Web-Based High-Dosage Tutoring (PAPER) which provides students in grades 3-12 with online access to English Language Arts (ELA) tutors 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Districts that sign up for this service will be able connect their students' courses to the tutoring platform so tutors will have access to the course content and assignments. Teachers and administrators at each school will monitor student progress and schedule one-on-one or small group tutoring sessions during the school day. Parents may also schedule tutorial services for their child(ren) after school hours and on the weekend. Six companies provide districts with supplemental digital subscriptions to online learning resources for all subjects, including English Language Arts for students in grades K-12. Online Learning Resources such as Newsela provides supplemental digital subscription to districts for online learning resources for students in grades K-12.

For districts that signed up, teachers assign tasks, or students use the resources to help with their assignments. Students can use the resources at home and during school breaks.

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 OSE is in the planning phase of restructuring the organization of the SSIP to help support more districts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The office will continue to seek applicants to employ as SSIP literacy coaches. The restructure entails employing three (3) additional Regional Coordinators, one (1) Regional Coordinator to support for Speech Language Pathologists, and sixteen (16) additional Literacy Coaches. We are also scaling-up to include grades 4-8. This will build the literacy capacity of secondary teachers as well as provide continued growth for students who have completed grades K-3. The new hiring process will use one centralized fiscal agent, such as a state agency or university. When an EIR, such as an SSIP literacy coach is needed, the MDE will contact the centralized fiscal agent and they will do the hiring and Human Resources processes. This will allow for a more timely and efficient process to get more boots on the ground.

The OSE will collect baseline data using the following tools:

Infrastructure Analysis which is a survey to gather information regarding infrastructure within schools and district support and IDEA indicators

Literacy Capacity Survey is a self-efficacy measure to gauge growth in perception of capacity over time

Teacher Knowledge of Early Literacy Skills (TKELS) is a skills-based survey that has been validated in MS

The Office of Policy and Programmatic Supports will work with the Office of Data and Compliance to determine what areas of improvement were deemed necessary for selected SSIP districts.

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.

SSIP Literacy Coaches offered support to K-3 teachers 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 grade three.

From August – May 2021-2022 SSIP Literacy Coaches provided the following coaching activities:

57 Co-Teaching

187 Modeling

516 Conferencing with Teachers

159 Professional Learning Communities

17 Professional Developments

170 Debriefing

10 Learning Walks

MDE's professional development team (PDC) offered in-person and virtual training, online Canvas courses and self-directed professional development on demand in the areas such as English Language Arts and special education topics.

Professional development sessions and participants for 2021-2022 SY:

428 trainings

65 Canvas courses

104 districts served

15,369 On-demand trainings viewed

11,002 participants (9,732 in-person/virtual & 1,270 Canvas course participants)

REACH MS focuses on district and schoolwide implementation of SEL, UDL, and PBIS practices through evidence-based professional development. Part of their first goal is to increase the percentage of K-12 students with disabilities who are showing growth in ELA on statewide assessments. The second goal is meeting the needs of individual educators, teachers focusing on low incidence priority groups and families of students with disabilities. There are some SSIP districts that also receive support through REACH MS Model Sites.

Professional Learning (training and coaching) provided Between October 1, 2021 – February 28, 2022

School Administrators – 147

General Education Teachers – 123

District-Level Staff – 59

Special Education Teachers – 56

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 grade three.

Conferencing between the SSIP literacy coach and teacher is meant to discuss strategies, feedback, and next steps based on model lessons, co-teaching, and/or teacher observations.

Co-teaching is used to jointly deliver a skill or strategy during instruction to improve teacher instructional practices. Debriefing allows the SSIP literacy coach and teacher or the SSIP literacy coach and the administrator to have constructive conversations about the implementation of the school literacy goals and specific next steps. Learning Walks allow a team to obtain a snapshot of student engagement, routines/procedures, and instructional/planning. Modeling allows the SSIP literacy coach to deliver a pre-planned skill or strategy while the teacher observes, and pre-post conferences are held. Professional Development is conducted formally for small or whole groups to improve professional knowledge, competence, skill, and effectiveness. Professional Learning Community is conducted informally to collaborate and share learning to increase effective planning, data analysis, and content knowledge development.

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.

The Office of Student Intervention Services coordinates and manages the review and award of student dyslexia scholarships, as well as the selection process of a State Board of Education approved list of dyslexia screeners. In addition, the intervention staff provides professional development and technical assistance related to dyslexia to parents, teachers, and administrators. In 2022, the Mississippi Dyslexia Support Guide was update. This guide supports teachers, administrators and parents with material needed to assist students with dyslexia. During the 2021 Regular Session, House Bill 754 was enacted by the legislature of the state of Mississippi:

AN ACT TO CREATE NEW SECTION 37-173-16, MISSISSIPPI CODE OF 1972, TO PROVIDE THE STEPS SCHOOLS MUST TAKE FOR THE EDUCATION AND CARE OF STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA AND OTHER RELATED DISORDERS; TO PROVIDE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL REQUIRE SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO CONDUCT FOUR HOURS OF AWARENESS TRAINING FOR DYSLEXIA AND OTHER RELATED DISORDERS TO ALL LICENSED EDUCATORS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTRUCTION; TO PROVIDE THAT STANDARD 1 AND STANDARD 2 OF THE INTERNATIONAL DYSLEXIA ASSOCIATION'S "KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS OF READING" 2018 EDITION SHALL BE THE MINIMUM CONTENT USED FOR THE DYSLEXIA TRAINING; TO AMEND SECTION 37-173-9, MISSISSIPPI CODE OF 1972, TO DELETE CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO SCHOOL'S DETERMINATION OF STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA; AND FOR RELATED PURPOSES.
 HB 754 (As Sent to Governor) - 2021 Regular Session (state.ms.us)

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

SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Reports are used to document supports and strategies provided by the SSIP literacy coaches, which 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 and/or Professional Learning Communities are 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.

MDE approved Universal Screeners are listed below:
 FAST: Adaptive Reading, CBMReading, and earlyReading English
 i-Ready
 Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP)
 mCLASS Reading 3D
 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)
 STAR Early Literacy
 STAR Reading

Average Scale Score School 1 and School 2 – STAR
 SPED BOY PM1 MOY EOY

K	408	423	479	562
1st	69	75	8	*
2nd	79	73	76	*
3rd	46	65	64	33**

School 1 – i-Ready
 SPED K-3 BOY MOY EOY
 At or Above Level 0% 10% 6%
 1 Level Below 30% 20% 24%
 > 1 Level Below 70% 60% 70%

School 2 – i-Ready
 SPED K-3 BOY MOY EOY
 At or Above Level 10% 35% 47%
 1 Level Below 72% 50% 50%
 > 1 Level Below 18% 13% 3%

School 3 – i-Ready
 SPED K-3 BOY MOY EOY
 At or Above Level 17% 36% 37%
 1 Level Below 17% 18% 27%
 > 1 Level Below 66% 45% 36%

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.

Universal screeners will be used to gather data on all students three times each school year (within 30 days of start of school; middle-of-year; end-of-year) to identify need for intervention. Data will help to determine whether each student is likely to meet, not meet, or exceed academic benchmark and needed tiered support will be developed. Effectiveness of overall curriculum and instruction for all students, as well as subgroups of students, will be measured using aggregated and disaggregated data.

MDE will offer AIM Institute for Learning and Research's Pathways Professional Development courses that will assist teachers and leaders in furthering their ability to apply the Science of Reading, while supporting Mississippi's mission to prepare students to compete in a global community. The comprehensive hybrid courses include asynchronous learning and two in-person training sessions:

Pathways to Literacy Leadership includes guidance and support for creating a Literacy Leadership Plan for your schools and fidelity tools to ensure classroom implementation.

Pathways to Proficient Reading focuses on implementing structured literacy learning into classroom instruction with content and tools available in the course for immediate classroom use, including AIM's Oral Language Talking Deck, lesson plan templates, decoding bookmarks, and an assessment guide for reading.

Educational Leader Participants will acquire knowledge through hundreds of learning tools including articles, teacher classroom videos, animations, and videos of experts in the field, practice with specially-designed interactive activities and downloadable resources to help translate new knowledge into instructional practice, create a literacy plan for their school and learn how to support teachers in implementing new instruction in the classroom, and benefit from in-person and virtual coaching sessions with AIM facilitators to support knowledge acquisition and classroom implementation.

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.

The MDE OSE is in the process of developing an SSIP Advisory Panel which will include SPED directors, district administrators, and teachers. In an effort to scale-up, the OSE will provide literacy support for students with disabilities in grades 4-8. The OSE is scheduling several SSIP Family Focus Group meetings to determine whether the SiMR will be revised based on Stakeholder Feedback. The reset of the SiMR should be considered to include grade 3 students with an OHI eligibility and grade 8 students with an SLD or OHI eligibility based on historical data and baseline data for grade 8 students.

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. Because Indicator baseline and targets were set last year based on stakeholder feedback, The MDE OSE did not seek feedback regarding updating targets or baseline. Rather based on stakeholder feedback, the MDE OSE determined that it would continue to report data to stakeholders and defer to stakeholders as to when updates or changes need to be made. Stakeholders would like to see some trend data prior to making changes.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The MDE OSE conducted the Mississippi Parent Conference that engaged parents in providing feedback on revising the SiMR's target.

The Office of Special Education conducted SSIP Family Focus Groups in targeted districts to provide feedback on how families feel the districts supports their students in the area of literacy.

Additional engagement strategies from MDE offices and other entities that the OSE collaborates with on the SSIP:

The Office of Elementary Education and Reading, supported by the Office of Intervention Services, conducted Families as Partners Literacy Nights across the State to inform families of the Literacy Based Promotion Act and provided resources for parents to use with their student(s) at home.

The Office of School Improvement (Miss. Code Ann. § 37-18-5) requires implementation of broad-spectrum community-based support for schools and districts implementing improvement plans to improve outcomes for learners. Districts host one or more information sessions before electing a Community Engagement Council (CEC). These information sessions emphasize the importance of CECs in the community and provide details about how community members can become involved and the importance of community engagement for school improvement.

REACH MS provided trainings and support such as webinars that were supported collaboratively by REACH MS and the MS Parent Training and Information Center (MSPTI), and the distribution of PBIS Family Toolkits which provides resources for families. Effectively helping families to have greater confidence to be effective partners in the education of their child(ren) with disabilities.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

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.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

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:

Sharon Strong Coon

Title:

Director of Data and Compliance

Email:

scoon@mdek12.org

Phone:

601-359-3498

Submitted on:

04/27/23 3:30:57 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
68.75%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	15	62.50%
Compliance	20	15	75.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	84%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	33%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	28%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	95%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	84%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	44%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	96%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	21%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	94%	1

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	13	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	66	0

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	NVR	N/A	0
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.71%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	53.91%	YES	0
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.96%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	93.32%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	0	0
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	20
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	25

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data ⁴			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	0	1	2
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	19
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	25
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	48.52
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9332
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.32

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>