

MISSISSIPPI PART B

Table A - Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 12: 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))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: On page 35 of the SPP, the State reported a 51% level of compliance for indicator 12, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.132(a)(b). The baseline data indicate that, for FFY 2004-2005, 51% of the children referred from Part C to Part B were determined eligible and receiving services by their third birthday. On page 35, the State further indicated that it made an assumption that all 329 students referred were eligible for Part B services, even though the data system was not able to specify which children (if any) were determined ineligible for services (measurement b).</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 12: 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))</p>	<p>The State did not include data in the SPP regarding the number of children referred from Part C to Part B who were determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility determinations were made prior to their third birthdays. The data provided by the State appears to indicate significant noncompliance, however, it will be important for MS to be able to determine how many of the children referred from Part C to Part B are determined to be NOT eligible.</p>	<p>The State did not provide all of the information required under Indicator 12, specifically the number of children referred from Part C to Part B who were determined to be not eligible and whose eligibility determinations were made prior to their third birthdays (measurement b). The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may impact OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>On page 54 of the SPP, the State provided information indicating that State-reported data for FFY 2004-2005 (under section 618 of the IDEA, in the SPP and in the APRs) were not reported in a timely manner. In addition, while the State provided some information that allows OSEP to make inferences regarding the State's intended targets for indicator 20, the State did not explicitly indicate that its targets are 100% for both timely data and accurate data reports.</p>	<p>The State must revise the targets in the APR, due February 1, 2007, to clarify that it is the State's intent to reach 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness regarding data reported, whether to OSEP or publicly, under section 618 of the IDEA, in the SPP and in the APRs. In addition, the State should review its activities to ensure that the State's plan will enable it to report, in the APR due February 1, 2007, 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness of data under section 618 of the IDEA, whether reported to OSEP or publicly.</p>